

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67443 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-134 Year-2024 Thana- AIRPORT District- Patna

Atul Priyadarshi son of Vinod Kunal Singh Resident of Village- Anthua, P.S.-
Aliganj, District- Darbhanga Presently Residing At Housing colony,
Kankarbagh, Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Smita Kumari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shahabuddin Azeem @ S. Azeem

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

5 06-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the Bank.

2. Petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered
for the offence punishable under Sections 338, 336(3), 340(2),
318(4) of BNS.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the
petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean
antecedent and the informants alleges that based on bidding,
M/s Biswas Signify Service was selected as an outsourcing
agency and the agency in lieu thereof had submitted bank
guarantee, the service of Biswas Signify Service was terminated
due to non-performance and the bank guarantee was seized and
the bank was asked to encash the same, when it transpired that



the bank guarantee was forged.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is next submitted that no doubt the company of the petitioner got the bid as an outsourcing agency for which the bank guarantee was submitted but then the said bank guarantee was obtained by Ajay, an employee of the company and the petitioner was completely unaware that Ajay had played fraud with the company, it is next submitted that when the contract of the company got cancelled, it was thereafter it came to the notice of the company that the bank guarantee was forged.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bank also submits that a counter affidavit has been filed wherein it has been specifically pleaded that the bank guarantee was not issued by the Bank.

6. The learned APP vehemently opposes the anticipatory bail application and submits that if what is being submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is the correct fact, in that event, the petitioner in order to establish his bona fide but to have paid an amount of Rs.19 lakhs and odd, i.e.. the sum of the bank guarantee, which was



submitted with the informant at the time when the contract was obtained, but then the petitioner is litigating which amply demonstrates his conduct.

7. Considering the submission made by learned A.P.P. the Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

sanjeev/-

U			
---	--	--	--

