

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41654 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-259 Year-2024 Thana- NAUHATTA District- Rohtas

Subhash Singh S/O Late Haribansh Singh Resident of Village- Balwaieya P.S
-Dinara, Dist- Rohtas at Sasaram

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dharmendra Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Bhushan Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 10-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Nauhatta P. S. Case No.259 of 2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) of the B.N.S.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant
alleges that petitioner, being Panchayat Secretary appointed
Dilip Kumar as Teacher without Dilip applying for the post and
Dilip based on forged appointment withdrew an amount of
Rs.9,22,747/- by way of salary, thus alleges that petitioner in
connivance with Dilip appointed him as a Teacher.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the



informant. It is next submitted that no show-cause was issued to the petitioner prior to instituting the instant FIR. It is submitted that had a show-cause been issued to the petitioner seeking his explanation, perhaps the FIR would not have been instituted.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that a specific allegation is alleged against the petitioner who is Panchayat Secretary that he appointed Dilip as a Teacher without Dilip applying for the post and Dilip continued to withdraw his salary as recorded herein above. It is further submitted that the case requires to be investigated and interrogation of the petitioner is necessary and investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

