IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45935 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010609502026
Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2026 Thana- DHIBRA District- Aurangabad

==========

AMRITA KUMARI W/O LATE SURESH YADAV R/o vill - Bhaluahi, P.S.- Baluganj (Dhibra), Distt.- Aurangabad, Bihar

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Superintendent of Police, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, 6 Circular Road, Patna Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Arya Achint, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad,APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

6 30-10-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and 120(B) of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman.

4. At this stage, learned APP for the State submits that case was taken upon 05.08.2026 thereafter on 25.08.2026, 27.09.2026 and 10.09.2026. Learned APP for the State next submits that on the aforesaid dates detailed orders were recorded, it is further submitted that in sum and substance, the allegation is that petitioner secured appointment as a Teacher

WEB COPY

based on forged and fabricated certificate, it is next submitted that it was insisted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that petitioner got appointed as a Teacher on a genuine certificate and not on forged and fabricated certificate, hence the District Education, the Superintendent of Police and the Vigilance Department were heard and the documents were produced and on perusal of the documents produced by the authority, it transpired that petitioner secured appointment as a Teacher on forged and fabricated certificate which also stands recorded in the aforesaid orders as recorded hereinabove.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned APP for the State Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the order dated 05.08.2026, 25.08.2026, 27.08.2026 and 10.09.2026, the Court is not inclined to extend the anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY