

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39855 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2026 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

=====

Lal Babu Rajak S/o Late Chandeshwar Rajak R/o Village- Ramsang, PS-
Harnaut, Distt- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Vigilance Department, Patna, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Sujit Kumar, Advocate
	:	Mr.Gaurav Govinda, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Ms.Veena Kumari Jaiswal, APP
For the Vigilance	:	Mr. Arvind Kumar, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-06-2026 Heard Mr. Sujit Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner, Mr. Arvind Kumar, learned counsel for the Vigilance
and Ms.Veena Kumari Jaiswal, learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail, who is in custody since
18.04.2026 in connection with Vigilance P.S. Patna FIR No.45
of 2026, F.I.R. dated 16.04.2026 registered for the offence
punishable under Section 7(a) of the Prevention of Corruption
Act, 1988.

3. As per FIR, the complainant stated that the
petitioner instead of taking the bribe amount of Rs. 40,000/-, he
was asked to give it to other co-accused, namely, Rumi Kundu,
he just handed over the bribe amount to her which was



recovered of Rs.40,000/- from the purse of co-accused, namely, Rumi Kundu by the vigilance Team.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. It appears from the FIR that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and as per allegation in the FIR, on the instance of the petitioner, the amount in question has been given to co-accused, namely, Rumi Kundu. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not given direction to co-accused, namely, Rumi Kundu to receive the amount in question on his behalf. From a bare perusal of the seizure list it appears that the recovery has been made from possession of co-accused person and petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on the basis of ulterior motive and nothing has come during investigation against the petitioner to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence and the Vigilance, after investigation, submitted the chargesheet against the petitioner and the petitioner is in custody since 18.04.2026.

5. Learned counsel for the Vigilance and learned APP for the State have opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner



and submits that as per allegation in the FIR, the petitioner has demanded the amount in question from the informant/complainant and on the instance of the petitioner, co-accused, namely, Rumi Kundu has received the amount in question, apart from that, the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one, as mentioned in para-3 of the bail petition.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the Vigilance, after investigation, submitted the chargesheet against the petitioner, let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned court below where the case is pending in connection with Vigilance P.S. Patna FIR No.45 of 2026, with the following conditions:-

(I) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the Court and on his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the



witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(III) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

