

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24863 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-31 Year-2026 Thana- SIMRI BAKHTIYARPUR District-
Saharsa

=====

Vandana Kumari Daughter of Late Kuldip Mehta Resident of village -
Maharas, Ward No.- 03, P.S.- Banma Itahari, District - Saharsa.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Additional Chief Secretary, Vigilance Department, Government of Bihar, Patna.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Mishra, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Ajay Mishra, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

4 20-07-2026 Heard Mr. Pramod Mishra, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Ajay Mishra, learned APP representing the

State as also Mr. Arvind Kumar, learned counsel for the

Vigilance Department, Bihar, Patna.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Simri Bakhtiyarpur P.S. Case No. 31 of 2026
registered for the offence punishable under Sections 420, 467,
468 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code, lodged on 28.01.2026
by the informant Sanjay Kumar.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged
that the lady was serving as contractual teacher in the Middle



School, Bakhtiyarpur but her Intermediate Mark Sheet was found to be forged and fabricated, accordingly, the F.I.R.

4. With the help of different paragraphs, learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on the basis of genuine certificate, she entered the job and it is her categorical submission/statement that she possess all the genuine certificates and on the basis of erroneous report of the Bihar School Examination Board, she has been put in the category of criminal. So far as resigning part is concerned, paragraph no.10 shows that she has left to perform her duties.

5. In CWJC No. 15459 of 2014, (Ranjit Pandit vs. the State of Bihar), Patna High Court gave long rope to those who are/were serving with forged and fabricated certificates to leave their respective jobs and escape lodging of the F.I.R. The claim of the Vigilance is that the petitioner continued despite having dubious certificate.

6. Taking into account the submissions of the parties and the fact that her certificate has been found to be forged and fabricated and further despite lodging of the F.I.R., she is continuing in the job and has chosen not resign, this Court is not inclined to extend her privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail application



stands rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner is confident that she has genuine certificates, armed with that, she can move for bail in next four weeks before the court and the concerned Court shall be passing an order in accordance with law.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--

