

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77513 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-21 Year-2025 Thana- BHAGWANPUR District- Vaishali

Nil Mani Singh @ Neel Mani Singh S/O Late Surendra Singh R/O Village-
Ratanpura, P.S.- Bhagwanpur, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ajay Thakur, Adv Ms. Vaishnavi Singh
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Khurshid Anwar, APP Mr. Gauri Shankar Thakur, Adv

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 3 26-02-2026 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, Sri Ajay Thakur; learned A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant.
- 2.** The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Bhagwanpur P.S. Case No. 21 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4) and 3(5) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita.
- 3.** Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has antecedent of two cases and is in custody since 21-8-2025 and the informant alleges that that the accused persons, being the Director, Manager and Agent of Nirmal Vishwas Nidhi Ltd. Bank, assured him of returns on his investment, accordingly, the informant started depositing



Rs.700/- per day for two years, as such, deposited an amount of Rs. 5 lakh/- but later came to know that the accused persons have closed the Bank on 28.12.2024 and fled away but still the agent kept collecting the installment till 30.12.2024.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner, who is alleged to be the Director of the Bank, has been falsely implicated in the instant case by the informant. It is further submitted that from perusal of the allegation as alleged in the FIR, it would manifest that the informant does not allege that it was petitioner who lured the investors in investing with the Bank. It is also submitted that the Bank was opened with an idea of creating wealth for the poor, but then the business failed.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that such institutions are mushrooming in the State of Bihar and are cheating innocent investors of their hard earned money and if the privilege of regular bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

6. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties, the Court is in complete agreement with the submission made by learned APP, as such the Court is not inclined to release the



petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

