

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43249 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-119 Year-2022 Thana- MAINATAND District- West Champaran

1. Savita Kumari @ Sunita Kumari W/o Vinod Ram @ Binod Ram Resident of Village- Jhajhari, Panchayat - Pidari, P.S.- Inarwa, District - West Champaran
2. Vinod Ram @ Binod ram S/o Bam Ram Resident of Village- Jhajhari, Panchayat - Pidari, P.S.- Inarwa, District - West Champaran
3. Srikant Mahto @ Srikant Prasad Kushwaha S/o Basdev Mahato Resident of Village- Jhajhari, Panchayat - Pidari, P.S.- Mainatand, District - West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bimlesh Kumar Pandey, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bhanu Pratap Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 468, 467, 47 of the IPC.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are person with clean antecedent and petitioner No. 1 is a woman and the informant alleges that his wife applied for appointment as an *Anganwadi Sevika*, further he gave an amount of Rs. 1,50,000/- to the CDPO for getting her appointed, but Sunita Kumari was appointed who gave Rs. 3,00,000/-.



4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is further submitted that a dispute had arisen with regard to appointment before the CDPO and the CDPO based on material available on record decided the case in favour of the petitioner No. 1 which was also upheld by the D.P.O., it is further submitted that petitioners vehemently rebuts the allegation as alleged in the FIR that an amount of Rs. 3,00,000/- was given for getting petitioner No.1 appointed as *Anganwadi Sevika*, it is further submitted that informant accepts that he had paid an amount of Rs. 1,50,000/- to the CDPO for getting his wife appointed, it is thus submitted that informant was seeking a backdoor appointment for his wife based on bribe which is in itself an offence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State also does not dispute the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner No. 1 selection as an *Anganwadi Sevika* was affirmed by the CDPO and thereafter, by District Program Officer also.

6. Considering the submissions and taking into consideration the fact that petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period



of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) each 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 Mainatand P.S. Case No. 119 of 2022 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

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

