

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38081 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-135 Year-2016 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

=====

Ramesh Chandra Prasad S/o- Late Shetal Prasad R/v- Chandpur Bela Ps-
Jakanpur Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through Vigilance Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Hemant Kumar- Advocate

For the Vigilance : Mr.Arvind Kumar- Special P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-06-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned Special P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 13(2), r/w 13(1)(e) of the P.C. Act 1988.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant
alleges that the petitioner was posted as District Welfare Officer,
Begusarai and was caught taking bribe of Rs.40,000/- from Jai
Prakash Chaudhary for which Vigilance P.S. Case No.09 of
2016 was instituted on 28.01.2016 and petitioner was arrested,
thereafter his flat was searched from where an amount of
Rs.40,700/- was recovered along with detail of land and other
instruments in the name of his wife and family member, thus



alleges that petitioner from the date of his appointment i.e. 17.11.1989 till 28.01.2016 had amassed disproportionate assets to the tune of Rs.69,91,500/- beyond his known source of income.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that in the instant FIR, it is alleged that the petitioner was arrested taking bribe for which Vigilance P.S. Case No. 09 of 2016 was instituted and after institution of the said case, the petitioner was taken in custody and thereafter his flat was raided from where cash and other articles were recovered for which the instant FIR has been instituted. It is further submitted that petitioner has been granted the privilege of regular bail in Vigilance P.S. Case No. 09 of 2016 and in the instant case, the petitioner has cooperated in the investigation and the vigilance never felt the need of arresting the petitioner, but then charge-sheet came to be submitted based on which cognizance was taken and thereafter summons were issued, but then petitioner never received any summon thereafter bailable and non-bailable warrant of arrest were issued and after issuance of non-bailable warrant of arrest, the police came knocking the door of the petitioner when he came



to know that charge-sheet has been submitted and cognizance has been taken. It is also submitted that since the vigilance never felt the need of arresting the petitioner during the course of investigation as petitioner cooperated in the investigation, as such, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner to jail when he has not received the summon after cognizance. It is also submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the trial to prove his innocence.

5. The learned Special P.P. does not dispute the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that vigilance during the course of investigation did not arrest the petitioner and petitioner cooperated in the investigation.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on bail on his furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/successor Court in connection with Special Case No.



73 of 2016 arising out of Vigilance P.S. Case No. 135 of 2016,
subject to the conditions laid down under Section 482(2) of the
B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

8. However, it is made clear that if the learned trial
court comes to a conclusion that petitioner after his release on
anticipatory bail is trying the delay the framing of charge or
after framing of charge is trying to delay the trial in any manner
in both the conditions, the learned trial court shall be at liberty
to cancel the anticipatory bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

