IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.62973 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC010898142026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-9 Year-2007 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Patna

==========

ROHIT KUMAR SINGH Son of Late Ganesh Prasad Singh Resident of Village- Kailaspuri, Ward No. -21, P.S.- Sadar, District- Saharsa.

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The Union of Inida through CBI. India.

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Roy, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar, A.P.P.

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE GIRIJISH KUMAR

CAV ORDER

5 28-10-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Special P.P. appearing for the CBI.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with RC No. 09(A) of 2007 registered for the offences under Sections 120B, 409, 418, 420, 468, 471 and 477A of the Indian Penal Code and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

3. According to the prosecution, the informant, namely, W. U. Azaman, Sr. Branch Manager, Bank of India, Katihar Branch submitted his written application, inter alia, alleging therein that during the period 2002-2005, Shri D.K. Mondal, the then Branch Manager, entered into a criminal conspiracy with certain borrowers, two panel advocates, namely, Shri

WEB COPY

Saquib Hussain and Shri Satya Narayan Jha along with the petitioner, who happens to be an approved Valuer of the Bank and sanctioned various loan. It is specifically alleged that the panel advocates deliberately furnished false legal opinions without verifying the genuineness of the title deeds and the petitioner in the capacity of approved valuer submitted valuations reports of the mortgaged properties. It is further alleged that the then Branch Manager, Shri D.K. Mondal, sanctioned several loans to different borrowers, as a result of which the Bank of India, Katihar Branch caused a wrongful loss of approximately Rs. 1.68 Crore.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that though the petitioner has been named in the F.I.R. but neither the petitioner has been involved in the alleged occurrence nor any single penny has been transferred to his account. He further submits that the petitioner being the approved valuer empanelled with concerned Bank has only submitted his report with regard to the valuation of the property after verification and he has not played any role in the sanction, processing or disbursement of the loan in question. He also

WEB COPY

submits that the genuineness and legality of the documents have been tested and verified by the paneled advocates, namely, Shri Saquib Hussain and Shri Satya Narayan Jha, who have already been granted bail vide Cr. Misc. No. 38373 of 2009 and Cr. Misc. No. 26472 of 2009 vide order dated 23.11.2009 and 12.03.2010, respectively, and this petitioner has neither seen the alleged documents nor he had any authority to recommend for sanction of loan on the basis of the alleged documents. The petitioner has not played any role in the alleged sanctioning and disbursement of the loan amount in any manner nor he has been a beneficiary of the alleged amount of loan. Moreover, no cogent material has surfaced against the petitioner during course of investigation to suggest his involvement in the alleged occurrence in any manner. He next submit that the petitioner being a senior citizen having aged about 72 years is languishing in custody since 22.07.2026 without any fault, therefore, he deserves to be enlarge on bail.

5. Per contra, learned Special P.P. for the CBI vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the petitioner happens to be the approved valuer of the Bank and he in collusion with the then Branch

WEB COPY

Manager along with others has submitted forged valuation report based on which the entire loan to the tune of Rs. 1.68 Crores have been sanctioned and disbursed to the customers causing pecuniary loss to the Bank. He further submits that it has been collected during course of investigation that the petitioner has submitted many false/fake valuation reports mentioning therein existence of land/building and its value, whereas no such land/building is found to be existing in many instances. The role of the petitioner in the alleged occurrence has been specified to the extent that he has submitted forged valuation report on that ground loans have been processed, sanctioned, disbursed and finally siphoned off. Moreover, on the basis of aforesaid materials collected during course of investigation, charge sheet has been submitted against the petitioner along with other accused persons under Sections 120B, 419, 420, 468, 471 of the I.P.C. and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the P.C. Act, 1988.

6. It has also been brought to the notice of this Court that the petitioner has been absconding since the inception of the investigation and he has been arrested on execution of non-bailable warrant and produced before the Court on

WEB COPY

22.07.2026 after 18 years from the date of registration of the F.I.R. and since then he is in custody. It has been recorded in the impugned order that the even after execution of process under Section 82 Cr.P.C., the petitioner has not appeared and has fled away after selling the entire property and therefore, vide order dated 25.09.2025, permanent warrant has been issued against the petitioner and the record was split up along with the case record of Abdul Gani @ Gani Khan, who has been convicted by the learned Court of Special Jude, CBI-I, Patna vide order dated 20.02.2026 along with co-accued, Dipak Yadav, under Sections 120-B r/w 419, 420, 468, 471, 174A of the I.P.C. Hence, the petitioner does not deserve to be enlarged on bail at this stage.

7. Considering the rival submissions of the parties and also the fact that during course of investigation, it has surfaced against the petitioner that he has submitted false/fake valuation reports mentioning therein existence of land/building on which loans have been sanctioned and disbursed and also the conduct of the petitioner that he had been evading since inception of the investigation, this Court is of the view that the conduct of the petitioner does not inspire confidence of this Court to consider his prayer for

WEB COPY

bail as he has failed to show his *bona fide* and if he would be allowed to be enlarged on bail, at this stage, he could again evade from the trial. Hence, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, at this stage. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail of this petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. However, learned trial court is directed to expedite the trial of the case and try to conclude it as early as possible.

(Girijish Kumar, J)

nitu/-

U		T	

WEB COPY