

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31315 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-345 Year-2025 Thana- EKMA District- Saran

Umesh Kumar Singh S/o- Mahesh Prasad Singh R/v- Hansrajpur,P.S. - Ekma,
Dist- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Patna Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Ajay Mishra, APP
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, Spl.P.P.
	:	Mr. Paritosh Parimal, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 15-07-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the

learned counsel for the Vigilance and the learned APP for the

State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in
connection with Ekma P.S. Case No. 345 of 2025, for allegedly
having committed offence under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471
and 120(B) of the IPC.

3. As per the prosecution story, which has been
lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the
Deputy Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Investigation
Bureau, Patna addressed to the S.H.O., Ekma Police Statoin to
the effect that in view of the orders passed by the Hon'ble Patna



High Court in C.W.J.C. No. 15459 of 2014, the educational certificate of teachers were being examined and during course of examination of the documents of the petitioner, which was provided by the District Programme Officer (Establishment) at Saran, it was found that the petitioner was employed as a Teacher in 2006 and is posted at Primary School, Mathanpura. It was further alleged that the appointment of the petitioner was made on the basis of his testimonials and teachers training marks. The teachers training mark-sheet/certificate of the petitioner was sent for verification of its genuineness before the Secretary/Examination Controller, Office of Registrar, Departmental Examination, Uttar Pradesh at Allahabad by the Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Bihar, Patna vide letter no. 5675 dated 14.05.2025. Upon information provided by the Registrar, Departmental Examination, Uttar Pradesh at Allahabad, the said certificate was found to be forged and fabricated.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that on the basis of the said verification, the present first information report was lodged. He submits that the petitioner was appointed as a teacher in the year 2006, after verification of all his testimonials/documents and till date, no doubt was ever raised with regard to genuineness of his documents, which was



submitted by him at the time of his appointment. He further submits that all of a sudden, the first information report was lodged and before that, no notice or show cause was given to the petitioner to the effect that his basic training certificate has been found to be fake, which is in complete violation of the principles of natural justice. He further submits that the first information report has been lodged without even hearing the petitioner and his certificate has been declared to be forged and fabricated, without the petitioner being afforded any opportunity. He further submits that the petitioner seriously disputes the report submitted by the Examination Department of Uttar Pradesh at Allahabad with regard to his certificate being found to be forged and fabricated. He further submits that in the report, which has been submitted by the Secretary, Examination Regulation Authority, Uttar Pradesh, Prayagraj, the name of six persons are there, whose certificates have been found to be forged and fabricated. He further submits that at serial no.1, the name of Nimal Kumari @ Nilam Kumari is there, whose certificate was also found to be forged and first information report was lodged against her. She filed anticipatory bail petition before this Hon'ble Court bearing Cr. Misc. No. 10729 of 2026 and the same was heard and allowed vide order dated



24.02.2026 passed by a Hon'ble Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court. He further submits that one Kumari Soni, whose name appears at serial no.5 along with the petitioner, whose certificate has been found to be forged, also filed anticipatory bail petition before this Hon'ble Court bearing Cr. Misc. No. 32043 of 2026. The said anticipatory bail petition has been allowed by a Hon'ble Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 13.05.2026. He further submits that one Ranjana Kumari, whose name is mentioned at serial no. 6, along with the petitioner in the report of the Secretary of Uttar Pradesh, Prayagraj, whereby the certificate of petitioner and 6 others were found to be forged. The said Ranjana Kumari filed anticipatory bail petition before this Hon'ble Court bearing Cr. Misc. No. 14863 of 2026 and the same was allowed by a Hon'ble Single Judge of this Hon'ble Court vide order dated 29.04.2026. He further submits that since similarly situated persons have been granted the privilege of anticipatory bail, the petitioner also deserves the same parity. He further submits that the petitioner has got a clean antecedent.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel for the Vigilance Investigation Bureau submits that the certificate of the petitioner and five other persons were found to be forged and the same has been communicated vide letter no. 806 dated 08.01.2025, issued



under the signature of the Registrar, Examination Regulatory Authority, Uttar Pradesh, Prayagraj and on the basis of same, first information report has been lodged. He further submits that pursuant to order passed by this Hon'ble Court in C.W.J.C. No. 15459 of 2014 (PIL), the certificates of petitioner and others teacher, who were appointed in between 2006 to 2015 were being verified. He further submits that during verification, the certificate of the petitioner was found to be forged and fabricated. He further submits that similarly situated teachers filed bail petition before this Hon'ble Court and the same was rejected vide order dated 27.02.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 58684 of 2023 and against the said order SLP (Crl.) No. 6560 of 2024 was filed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India. The same was rejected vide order dated 25.07.2024. He further submits that one Soni Kumar filed anticipatory bail petition before this Hon'ble Court bearing Cr. Misc. No. 63847 of 2025 and vide order dated 01.12.2025, the same was rejected and was affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in S.L.P. (Crl.) No. 270 of 2026 vide order dated 16.03.2026. He further submits that the petitioner was appointed on a forged document and therefore, he does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.



6. The learned APP for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

7. Having heard the rival submissions and after going through the records, it appears that despite opportunity granted by the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court to such teachers to resign on their own, who were appointed on the basis of forged documents, the petitioner choose not to resign and he continued to draw the monetary benefits as a teacher. The allegation against the petitioner appears to be serious in nature and he did not resign on his own, despite opportunity granted to him by the virtue of the order of the Hon'ble Division Bench and he continued to draw the monetary benefits as a Block/Panchayat Teacher. Now, in 2025 it has been found that his educational qualification was forged. Further a learned Co-ordinate bench vide order dated 18.01.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 78970 of 2023 (Sanjeev Kumar Raman vs. The State of Bihar) has rejected the Anticipatory Bail petition. Similar view was taken by a learned Co-ordinate bench vide order dated 27.02.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 58684 of 2023 (Punita Devi vs. The State of Bihar & Ors.). The order dated 27.02.2024 has been affirmed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in SLP (Crl.) No. 6560 of 2024 vide order dated 25.07.2024. So far the orders



relied upon by the petitioner i.e. Cr. Misc. No. 32043 of 2026, Cr. Misc. No. 14863 of 2026 and Cr. Misc. No. 10729 of 2026 are concerned, this Court finds that while granting the privilege of anticipatory bail, the orders passed by the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India, whereby the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India was pleased to affirm the orders passed by this Hon'ble Court, whereby the anticipatory bail petition/regular bail petition of the petitioners were rejected, were not brought to the notice of the Hon'ble Co-ordinate Benches of this Court and therefore, the petitioner cannot be allowed parity in terms of the orders referred to above. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the anticipatory bail petition of the petitioner is rejected.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

AjayMishra/-

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

