

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45243 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-792 Year-2025 Thana- SHASTRINAGAR District- Patna

SHYAMA SINHA W/O LATE RAVI KISHOR R/O Mohalla- Magadh Vikash Colony, Khajpura, Mamiya path, Rukunpura, B. V. College, P.S.- Shastri nagar, Dist.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Sanjay Prasad S/O late Shiv Chandar Prasad R/O Vill.- Haibatpur, P.s.- Rampur Chauran, Dist.- Arwal

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Tej Narayan Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar Tiwary, APP
	:	Mr. Rahul Anand, Adv.
	:	Ms. Sristi Kumari, Adv.
	:	Mr. Shubhankar Prabhakar, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 28-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 318(4) of the BNS.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that allegation against the petitioner is that petitioner being director was involved in the Management of Financial Institution which was being run in the name of Lok Kalyan Nidhi Limited, on assurance, the informant and others deposited their hard earned



money, but despite the deposit maturing, the organization failed to return the amount and the informant and persons like him are moving around the offices for the payment of their deposited amount, but to no avail.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant being Director of the company, it is further submitted that no doubt Lok Kalyan Nidhi Limited was incorporated and there were seven directors including the petitioner and her husband, but then her husband died in the year 2020, as such, the other directors of the company asked her to remain associated with the company but not in the capacity of Director.

5. On query of the Court that as to whether any documentary evidence is on record to substantiate that the petitioner was removed from the post of director of the company, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that there is no document to substantiate the said submission, but based on instruction, the submission has been made.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that Deepak Kumar had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous



No. 35886 of 2026 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 23.07.2026 passed by a learned Coordinate Bench, further Rajesh Kumar also had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 37120 of 2026 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 22.06.2026.

7. Learned A.P.P. at this stage submits that hard earned money of poor people is invested in such organization as the organization lured investors with high returns, but when it comes to repayment, the money is siphoned off. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant and learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. Accordingly, the application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

rajesh/-

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

