

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69816 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-47 Year-2023 Thana- SAHIYARA District- Sitamarhi

Mamta Kumari Wife of Sanjeev Kumar Singh R/o Village - Adauri, P.S.-
Purnahiya, District – Sitamarhi. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Vigilance Investigation Bureau, through Police Inspector-Cum-
Investigation Bureau, Patna Range, Patna, Bihar. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Mishra, APP
For the Vigilance : Mr. Paritosh Parimal, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AJIT KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

3 21-01-2026 Heard Mr. Mrityunjay Kumar, learned counsel for
the petitioner, Mr. Ajay Mishra, learned APP for the State and
Mr. Paritosh Parimal, learned counsel representing the
Vigilance.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in
connection with Sahiyara P.S. Case No. 47 of 2023 for the
offence punishable under sections 420, 467, 468, 471 and
120(B) of the IPC lodged on 19.03.2023 by the informant.

3. As per the prosecution case, the allegation against
the petitioner is that she is said to have been appointed as
untrained teacher by annexing a forged certificate of experience.
The alleged experience certificate of the petitioner bearing
Certificate No. 296 was found to be fake by the authorities
concerned, when it was sent for verification. Accordingly, the
FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that for



an allegation that the experience certificate appended with the application, for seeking appointment on the post of Panchayat Teacher, has been found to be forged while the petitioner's case is that her appointment was made on the basis of requisite degree and till today, she has not acquired experience and therefore, the certificate which is said to have been appended, is not produced by her. Learned counsel further submits that the nature of dispute having been raised in the FIR appears to be a service dispute which can well be addressed by the authorities who are said to have issued appointment letter and the service of the petitioner has already been terminated.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel appearing for the Vigilance as well as learned APP opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail. However, they do not dispute about the factum of the service of the petitioner being terminated.

6. Considering the aforesaid submissions and the fact that the service of the petitioner has already been terminated, this Court is inclined to extend her the privilege of anticipatory bail.

7. Let the petitioner, above named, be released on bail in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of



Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned ***Chief Judicial Magistrate, Sitamarhi*** in connection with aforesaid PS Case, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS as well as the following conditions:-

(i) one of the bailors should be the family member/relative of the petitioner(s) who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner(s) shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his/their bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iii) the petitioner(s) shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;

(iv) the petitioner(s) shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of his/their bail bonds.

(Ajit Kumar, J)

perwez

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

