

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67719 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2608 Year-2022 Thana- EAST CHAMPARAN COMPLAINT
District- East Champaran

Rina Devi W/O Mukesh Kumar @ Mukesh Yadav Ex- Mukhiya Gram
Panchayat Raj Gheghwa, Resident of Village- Phajilpur, Police Station-
Rajepur, District- East Champaran at Motihari ... Petitioner/s
Versus

1. The State of Bihar Patna
2. Rajnish Kumar Pandey S/O Dharmendra Kumar Pandey Resident of Village-
Raghunathpur, Police Station- Raghunathpur O.P., District- East Champaran
at Motihari

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Karandeep Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Harendra Prasad, A.P.P.
Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

4 02-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. Petitioner apprehends arrest in a case registered for
the offence punishable under sections 406/420 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, complainant is a contractor
and for the purpose of installation of LED light in the Panchayat
and village under the government scheme, this petitioner and
another co-accused contacted the complainant and entered into
an agreement for Rs 25,50,000/- for installation of 600 LED
lights in the Panchayat and village. It is stated that the
complainant installed the same in the Panchayat and village as
per contract made between the complainant and the petitioner
and other accused for which the accused persons gave Rs.
5,07,500/- to the complainant and assured him to return the
remaining amount after withdrawal of money. After some time,
complainant came to know that the accused persons withdrew



the money and when the complainant demanded his remaining amount, they started making excuses, which shows that the accused persons cheated the complainant.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is former Mukhia and she is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case due to political rivalry for getting wrongful gain. Petitioner claims clean antecedent.

5. Learned counsel for the State and the informant oppose the prayer for bail.

6. Considering the nature and gravity of accusation, prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashi/-

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

