

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64415 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2025 Thana- JOGSAR District- Bhagalpur

=====

Rima Mukherjee @ Reema Mukherjee D/O Mr. Ranjan Mukherjee R/O 1/B
Arrah Football Maidan, P.s.- Aribindo, District- Brddhaman, West Bengal-
713212

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

- 1 . The State of Bihar Patna
2. Brijendra Kumar Srivastava S/O NA R/O C10, Kalyanpur, West Majar
Road, Ring Road, P.S.- Godamba, Lucknow

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Ankita Kumari , Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr.Mrityunjaya Kr.Gautam , Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 08-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the

State .

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered for
the offence punishable under section 318(4), 61(2), 338, 336(3),
340(2), 351(3) and 111 of BNS.

3 . As per the prosecution case , informant namely ,
Brijendra Kumar srivastava, alleged that he was posted as
Project Land Co-ordinator at Bhagalpur and was given
responsibility by the company for security of land worth Rs. 100
Crore registered in the name of three companies as recorded in
the F.I.R. Further, Raj Kumar Ranjan , a land mafia intended to
grab the land of the company, hence , co-accused Raj Kumar



Ranjan through his associate Rima Mukherjee (petitioner) presented a fake board resolution and power of attorney issued from Kolkata for registering deeds at Bhagalpur. Further, an information was given to Ambuja shelter Private Limited i. e ., the company on 21.03.2025 to verify the document by Bhagalpur Registry on E – mail, in pursuance whereof the company sent the original document to Bhagalpur Registry on 29.03.2025 , where it transpired that fake documents were presented.

4. learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that no doubt, the petitioner executed a power of attorney on behalf of the company in favour of Raj Kumar Ranjan, but the same was based on a resolution of the Board of the Company which had authorized the petitioner to execute the said power of attorney. It is further submitted that power of attorney is not a fake document and the petitioner accepts that she had executed the said document in favour of Raj Kumar Ranjan, but the document was executed only when she was authorized by the company by a board resolution. The learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that Raj Kumar Ranjan has been granted the privilege of



anticipatory bail by an order dated 16.07.2025 in A.B.P. No.1384 of 2025 passed by the learned District & Additional Sessions Judge-16th, Bhagalpur.

5 . Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposed the bail and submitted that petitioner submitted forged board resolutions, allegedly authorizing her to execute a power of attorney in favour of co-accused Raj Kumar Rnajan, dated 27.02.2025 . These documents were later formally denied and declared forged by the directors of the respective companies vide letter dated 03.04.2025 . The district Sub-Registrar, Bhagalpur, had also issued a letter dated 21.03.2025 seeking clarification regarding the forged resolutions. It is further submitted that in paragraph 84 of the case diary, one of the witnesses Nand Lal categorically denied ever signing or sending such resolution . The alleged forged resolutions, used by the petitioner to execute power of attorney , are central to the prosecution case and reflect active and direct participation of the petitioner in preparation and submission of fabricated documents, which are the foundation of the alleged fraudulent transaction . The complicity of the petitioner is further supported by the detailed correspondence between her and the Sub- Registrar, the trail of documents and the statements of



witnesses. Prima facie , ingredients of offences under Section 318 (4), 336 (3) etc of BNS are disclosed against her.

6. In view of the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case , nature of accusation and gravity of offence and petitioner’s active role in the present occurrence , prayer for pre-arrest bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

Koushik/-

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

