

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.65556 of 2024

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

=====

Anil Kumar son of Ram Naresh ingh Village- and po- Kolhua Thikha, Ps-
Purnahya, Dist- Sheohar At Present GDS BPM, Kolhua Thikha Branch office
in Account With Riga so under Sitamarhi Division, Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The union of India through the Superintendent of Police, C.B.I. Bihar, Dist-
Patna bihar
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 State	:	Mr. A.P.P.
For the C.B.I.	:	Mr. Shashank Chandra, Spl. P.P./SC

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-05-2026 Heard learned senior counsel, Mr. Ramakant

Sharma, appearing 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	
---	--	---	--

