IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.34155 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-20 Year-2023 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Khagaria

==

Jatin Goyal @ Yogesh Sahu @ Yogesh S/o Ramesh Sahu @ Ramesh Kumar R/o Village- Itarsi Buto Muta Near Mandil Saktinagar, P.S.- Itarsi, District- Naradapuram, State- Madhayapradesh ... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar ... ... Opposite Party/s

==

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 68914 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-20 Year-2023 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Khagaria

==

Shankar Mishra @ Krishna Mahanti @ Shankar S/o Ramkripal Mishra R/o Village- Chausa, P.S.- Chausa, Distt- Buxar ... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar ... ... Opposite Party/s

==

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 34155 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Chandan Kumar Kashyap
For the State	:	Mr. Binod Kumar

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 68914 of 2025)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Chandan Kumar Kashyap
For the State	:	Mr. Bharat Bhushan

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NAWNEET KUMAR PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

9 02-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners as well as informant and the learned APP for the State.

2. In this case, the petitioners are seeking regular bail in connection with Khagaria (Cyber) P.S. Case No. 20 of 2023, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 379, 467, 468, 471, 120B/34 of the IPC and Section 66D of the I.T. Act.

3. As per allegation, the petitioner Jatin Goyal apprised the informant over phone that Alliance Solution

Company is trading in share market for about ten years. The C.E.O.-cum-owners, namely, Yashika Bansal and Sher Singh Bakodiya and Abhinav Gupta and Rajesh Kumar are also office bearers of the Company. The company assured the informant to provide 25.40 per cent monthly return and also assured monthly payment every month. It has further been alleged that through the mobile, whereby, the conversation was made between the informant and the petitioner, Jatin Goyal, some forged documents of agreements were sent. The informant, on the assurance given, invested Rs. 53,50,000/- in the said company. Later on, he received Rs. 5,83,480/-. It has further been alleged that the informant talked several times with the petitioner, namely, Jatin Goyal and others, namely, Azad Tiwari, Bhaskar Kumar and other officials of Alliance Solution Customer Support, but it remained nothing but a futile effort. Having no option, he went to the office of the Company in Bhopal where he did not find the trace of the Company. Then, he went to Bangalore and there also, he did not find the trace of the Company. It is alleged that by committing fraud, the petitioners and other co-accused persons cheated him by deception.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner, namely, Jatin Goyal @ Yogesh Sahu has submitted that the petitioner is

innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He is mere employee of the company and is not involved in managerial functions of the company. It has further been submitted that Rs. 5 lakhs and odds were refunded to the informant which shows that it is not intention of the company to deceive the informant or his wife. No transaction of money was made in the account of the petitioner. It has further been submitted that one co-accused has been granted bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court and one co-accused person has been granted bail by the Hon'ble Apex Court (SLP No. 16934 of 2025).

5. It has been argued on behalf of petitioner, namely, Shankar Mishra @ Krishna Mahanti that wife of this petitioner has been granted bail. It has further been submitted that he is also a lower grade employee of the Alliance Solution Company. Both the petitioners are in custody since 10.11.2023 i.e. more than two years.

6. On the other hand, learned counsel for the informant has submitted that the petitioners committed forgery and cheated innocent investors and they are involved in so many other cases of similar nature. Learned counsel has also submitted that on similar footing, bail application of other co-accused persons, who are not named in the FIR, have been

rejected whereas the petitioners are named in the FIR.

7. At the instance of petitioner, Shankar Mishra @ Krishna Mahanti, money which was received by the Company, was deposited in the account of his wife. The complicity of the petitioners transpires in paragraph nos. 236, 258 and 259 of the case diary.

8. Considering the above-mentioned facts and circumstances, the petitioners do not deserve privilege of bail. Accordingly, it is rejected.

(Nawneet Kumar Pandey, J)

priyanka/-

U		T	