

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68349 of 2024

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

=====

Sujeet Kumar @ Sujit Kumar Son of Indra Kant Pathak Resident of Village Bhalhi, P.O. Harpur Bhalha, P.S. Bhathnaha, District - Sitamarhi, at Present GDS MD/MC at Lattipur with Maghulia Estate SO under Sitamarhi Division, Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The Union of India through the Superintendent of Police, CBI, Bihar BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajit Ranjan Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. A.P.P.
For the C.B.I.	:	Mr. Noilanjan Chatterjee, Spl. P.P./Sc
		Mr. Ujjwal Raj, Advocate
		Mr. Anirvan Choudhary, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, 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 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	
---	--	---	--

