

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-10 Year-2025 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anand Ojha, Sr. Advocate
Mr. Ashok Kumar Karna, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 15-04-2026 1. Heard learned Senior counsel for the petitioner, Mr.
Anand Ojha and learned Special PP for the Vigilance, Mr.
Arvind Kumar.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 13(1)(2) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988.

3. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits



that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that the then PACS President Ramdeo in connivance with the Cooperative Officer did not purchase paddy from the farmers, rather the paddy was purchased directly from the market and the same was procured by FCI in the year 2008-2011 by making payment in fake names and account of farmers, thus, an amount of Rs. 10 lakhs was misappropriated.

4. Learned Senior counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the thrust of the allegation of misappropriating public money is against Ramdeo, the then PACS President against whom it is alleged that he did not purchase paddy from the farmers rather purchased the paddy directly from the market for the financial year 2008-2011 and payments were made in fake names and account of farmers, thus, he misappropriated an amount of Rs. 10 Lakhs. It is next submitted that the petitioner is a Cooperative Extension Officer and he was posted on the said post on 04.08.2015, it is thus submitted that when the occurrence took place, the petitioner was not posted as Cooperative Extension Officer. It is further submitted that Lakhisarai P.S. Case No. 524 of 2016 dated 21.10.2016 was earlier instituted against Ramdeo with regard to



the same occurrence and the police after investigation submitted charge sheet and thereafter a certificate case also came to be instituted against Ramdeo for recovering the misappropriated money. It is next submitted that in the certificate case, it is being alleged that this petitioner submitted a report in favour of Ramdeo leading to dropping of certificate case. It is submitted that if the authorities were aggrieved by the fact that Certificate Officer had dropped the certificate case based on a manipulated report of the petitioner in that event the authorities had remedy of assailing the order dropping certificate case before a superior forum, but then that was not done. It is submitted that order dropping certificate case has attained finality, but then it is being alleged that petitioner, in connivance with Ramdeo and others, got the certificate case dropped. It is next submitted that since the order of the Certificate Officer dropping the certificate case has not been assailed by the authorities before any superior forum that in itself demonstrates that the certificate case was rightly dropped, but the authorities with a view to save their own skin found a scapegoat in the petitioner and the petitioner came to be implicated in the instant case. The learned Senior counsel also submits that petitioner is a government servant and will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to



prove his innocence.

5. Learned Special P.P. for the Vigilance opposes the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner, but then is not in a position to rebut the submissions of the learned Senior counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner that the order of the Certificate Officer dropping the certificate case has not been assailed by any authorities before a superior forum, as such, it cannot be alleged that it was petitioner who was instrumental in submitting a report in favour of Ramdeo leading to dropping of the certificate case.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Vigilance P.S. Case No. 10 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of BNSS.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event if the Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the learned Trial Court bringing to its notice that petitioner despite



giving assurance to this Court is not co-operating in the investigation, in that event the learned Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. Let a copy of this order be sent to the concerned police station through the learned Trial Court.

9. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands allowed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

