

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66702 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-24 Year-2014 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Patna

Manoj Kumar S/o Lal Babu Singh R/o vill - Shyampur Tole Chamainiya,
ward no. 2, P.S. - Shyampur Bhatha, Distt. - Sheohar, at present GDS BPM,
Rasalpur Raghunathpur Branch Office, Distt. - Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The Union of India through the Superintendent of Police, C.B.I., Bihar Patna
2. The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ramakant Sharma, Sr. Advocate Mr. Ajit Ranjan Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. A.P.P.
For C.B.I.	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, Spl. P.P./Sc

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2026 Heard learned senior counsel for the petitioner, Mr. Ramakant Sharma, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned Standing Counsel for the C.B.I.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 120B, 420, 467, 468, 471 of the Indian Penal Code read with Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the P.C. Act.

3. The learned senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been implicated in the instant case with an allegation that he secured appointment as Gramin Dak Sewak based on forged and fabricated certificate of Bihar Sanskrit Shiksha Board, it is next submitted that F.I.R.



came to be instituted based on an enquiry conducted behind back of the petitioner, it is further submitted had an opportunity been given to the petitioner to explain his case perhaps the F.I.R. would not have been instituted, it is also submitted that F.I.R. was instituted in the year 2014 and the petitioner till date is working, it is further submitted that C.B.I. after investigation submitted charge-sheet but then C.B.I. during the course of investigation never felt and need of arresting the petitioner, it is thus submitted that if petitioner was not arrested during the course of investigation and charge-sheet has been submitted, no useful purpose would be served by sending the petitioner to jail.

4. The learned Standing Counsel appearing on behalf of the C.B.I. opposes the anticipatory bail and submits that counter affidavit has been filed but then is not in a position to rebut the submission of learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that F.I.R. is of the year 2014 and the C.B.I. after investigation submitted charge-sheet and during the course of investigation, the C.B.I. never felt the need of arresting the petitioner.

5. Considering the submissions of the parties, I am inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Let the petitioner, as named above, in the event of



his arrest or surrender within four weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/-(Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court of Special Judge, C.B.I., Muzaffarpur, in connection with Trial No.23 of 2022 arising out of RC024A of 2014, subject to the conditions laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

sanjeev/-

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

