

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30139 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-105 Year-2026 Thana- BAHERA District- Darbhanga

Babulal Chaudhary @ Babulal Chaudhari S/o- Late Jagdish Chaudhary R/v-
Mohammadpur Ps- Giriyak Dist- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Krishna Deo Raj, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kanhiya Kishor, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

2 07-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection with Bahera P.S. Case No. 105 of 2026 lodged on 08.02.2026, for the offence punishable under Sections 319(2), 318(4), 338, 336(3), 340(2) & 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and section 10 of the Bihar Conduct of Examinations Act, 1981, pending in the Court of A.C.J.M., Benipur, Darbhanga.

3. As per the prosecution, FIR has been lodged against two named accused persons other than the petitioner. It has been alleged in the FIR that accused person Suman Raj appeared in the examination of CTET in place of accused Sahil Kumar by using forged and fabricated Aadhar Card.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and he has been unnecessarily made accused in this case. Counsel submits that the petitioner is not named in the FIR and his name has come in this case by virtue of confessional statement during the investigation. Counsel submits that in the FIR, there is no disclosure against him and by Annexure-P/2, it is evident that on the said date of examination, the petitioner was at Nalanda and not at Darbhanga where the alleged forgery and offence have been committed. He submits that the petitioner is a teacher, having clean antecedent.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the trial court at the time of rejection of the bail has categorically acknowledged after going through different paragraphs of the case diary in which, the co-accused has given statement by which involvement of the petitioner has clearly transpired. It has also been observed by the Sessions Court that case diary, CDR and SDR of the petitioner is attached in which, tower location of the petitioner is found in Nalanda and there are details of accused petitioner being on telephonic conversation with the co-accused.

6. In the present facts and circumstances of this case,



considering that huge forgery and interpolation is going on in the different exams as also in the present case, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

(Dr. Anshuman, J)

Divyansh/-

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

