IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77191 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011113522026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-829 Year-2025 Thana- JAKKANPUR District- Patna

==========

Prakash Kumar S/O Manohar Ravidas R/O Mohalla- Beldari Tola, Bahari Begampur, Begampur Dhaulpura, Patna City, PS- Bypass, Dist- Patna

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Kumar Ravi Shankar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs.Rina Sinha,APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State and the informant in person.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2) and 318(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and the informant alleges that on 10.10.2025 at about 06:00 PM while he was purchasing vegetables from Mithapur vegetable market when his mobile went missing, on calling from a different mobile, his mobile rang, but the call was disconnected, hence the informant requested the Airtel to deactivate the Sim and obtained new Sim, further on 12.10.2025 on checking the account details,

WEB COPY

informant found that an amount of Rs. 5,000/- on 10.10.2025 was withdrawn from his account, further an amount of Rs. 40,000/- via Phonepe was transferred from his account on 11.10.2025 in the account of petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant, it is further submitted that no doubt the amount was credited in the account of the petitioner, but then the petitioner is not aware how the said amount came to be credited in his account, it is next submitted that even the amount was withdrawn, but then the said amount was not withdrawn by the petitioner, but by his friend who used his ATM.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that it is a case of cyber fraud, it is next submitted that the amount which was credited in the account of the petitioner was also withdrawn which amply demonstrates the connivance of the petitioner, it is next submitted that it does not appear probable that friend of the petitioner would have used his ATM for withdrawing the amount.

6. At this stage, learned APP for the State that investigation in the case is continuing.

WEB COPY

7. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

8. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the informant in person, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

9. Accordingly, the instnat anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Nitesh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY