

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.74180 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-435 Year-2023 Thana- CIVIL LINE District- Gaya

=====

Runita Devi @ Sumanti Devi @ Sunaina Devi, wife of Sri Pramod Prasad
R/o Village - Pranpur, P.S. Paraiya, Dist. - Gaya Ji.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aryan Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Fahimuddin

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 10-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in Civil Lines P. S.

Case No.435 of 2023 registered for the offences punishable
under Sections 409, 420, 467, 468, 471 and 34 of the Indian
Penal Code.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits
that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is in
custody since 22.06.2025. It is next submitted that the
informant alleges that he received a complaint from Kishor
Kumar and Sunaina Devi alleging that their land was
acquired under Amritsar Kolkata Industrial Corridor
Project, hence for seeking compensation, they had given the



requisite documents to Santosh and Pankaj Tirky, employees of Land Acquisition Office, Dobhi. Further, on enquiry, it transpired that the amount of compensation has been credited in a fake account opened in their name in South Bihar Gramin Bank when they had their account in Bank of Baroda, as such, the accused persons misappropriated an amount of Rs.17,20,000/- of Kishor Kumar and Rs.17,00,000/- of Sunaina Devi.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner next submits that Pankaj Tirky had approached this Court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.74247 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 06.02.2026, on which the learned A.P.P. submits that from perusal of the order dated 06.02.2026 in Cr. Misc. No.74247 of 2025, it would manifest that the same records that the S.H.O. and the Investigating Officer were present in the Court on 16.01.2026 in compliance of the order dated 09.01.2026 in Cr. Misc. No.74247 of 2025 and the S.H.O. submitted that during the course of investigation, an amount of Rs.5 Lacs was credited in the account of Pankaj Tirky, since Pankaj Tirky deposited an amount of Rs.2,50,000/- in



the account of Kishor Kumar and Rs.2,50,000/- in the account of Sunaina Devi through RTGS, as such, Pankaj Tirky was granted the privilege of regular bail.

5. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that the name of the petitioner is Runita Devi and she is wife of Pramod Prasad, since her name rhymes with Sumanti and Sunaina, as such, she came to be implicated in the case in a mechanical manner without there being any evidence on record to suggest that she was also involved in the occurrence, on which the learned A.P.P. submits that during the course of investigation, it transpired that accounts were opened in South Bihar Gramin Bank and the amount credited in the said account of the victims was withdrawn by fake persons when victim did not have any account in the said bank. It is next submitted that during the course of investigation, it also transpired that Sunaina Devi herself had withdrawn the amount from her account in South Bihar Gramin Bank, but then, as per FIR, Sunaina Devi was not even aware that an account in her name was opened in South Bihar Gramin Bank as she had given the documents relating to Bank of



Baroda where the amount was to be credited, but it appears that the officials of the land Acquisition Office at Dobhi connived and opened a forged account in the name of the victim with South Bihar Gramin Bank and the money was siphoned off.

6. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner is in custody since 22.06.2025 and one Lal Vijay Kumar had approached this Court seeking regular bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.79458 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 29.01.2026. It is further submitted that name of Lal Vijay Kumar transpired during the course of investigation based on CCTV footage of the bank and allegation against him was of withdrawing an amount Rs.4 Lacs from the bank in question, on which the learned A.P.P. submits that the case of the petitioner is not akin to the case of Lal Vijay Kumar as the money of the victim has been withdrawn by the accused persons in connivance and during the course of investigation also material transpired against the petitioner connecting her with the offence based on which she was taken in custody. It is further submitted that if petitioner is



released on bail, the petitioner may abscond.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

8. The prayer of the petitioner for bail stands rejected.

9. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew her prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

