

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78986 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-2 Year-2025 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

Rajnikant Praveen @ Rajnikant Pravin S/o- Radhika Raman Prasad Sinha
R/v- Pokharpur Ps- Giriyak Dist- Nalanda

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through Spl. Vigilance Unit, Patna Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s :

Mr. P.N. Shahi, Sr. Adv.

Mr. Hemant Kumar, Adv.

Mr. Gaurav Prakash, Adv.

For SVU

Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

6 18-02-2026

Heard Mr. P.N. Shahi, learned senior counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, learned counsel for the SVU.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 13(1)(b) read with Section 12 of the P.C. Act and Section 61(2) (a) of the B.N.S.

3. The case of the prosecution is that a D.A. case was registered against the petitioner, who was District Education Officer, Bettiah, West Champaran and his wife, who was a contractual teacher by the Special Vigilance Unit with the allegation that they had accumulated disproportionate assets to the extent of Rs. 1,87, 23, 625/- which was earned through corrupt and illegal means.

4. Learned senior counsel for the petitioner submits, at



the outset, that the petitioner was the District Education Officer, Bettiah while his wife was earlier a contractual teacher and subsequently Director of School. It is submitted that after the lodging of the First Information Report, cash and jewelry were shown to have been recovered from the residential premises of the petitioner at Bettiah and the rented residential premises of the wife and upon completion of investigation, the disproportionate asset was found to be Rs. 7,39,53,502/- during the check period. It is further submitted that the legitimate and verifiable income of the petitioner and his wife have been deliberately overlooked by the Special Vigilance Unit (SVU) and proper consideration of the petitioner's actual income during the check period from different legal sources, which is to the tune of Rs. 4,38,75,202/- has also not been properly considered. Similarly, the income of the petitioner's wife during the relevant period has also not been properly calculated and as a matter of fact, the actual income of the petitioner along with his wife would be Rs. 6,71,10,514/-. The Investigating Agency has also not considered the fact that the amount recovered during the search pertains to one Yes Kriti Foundation duly registered charitable trust managed by the petitioner's mother-in-law and the property of the trust has been wrongly calculated



under the head of petitioner's asset. It is further submitted that the investigation has come to a close and charge-sheet has been submitted on 10.10.2025 while the petitioner is in custody since 13.08.2025 with no criminal antecedent. Learned senior counsel has also submitted that there are several witnesses to be examined and several documents to be exhibited on behalf of the SVU as is demonstrated by the charge-sheet itself leading to the fact that there is no likelihood of the conclusion of the trial even after its commences in the near future. The case of **Sanjay Chandra Vs. C.B.I.** has been relied upon to contend that once the Investigating Agency has already completed investigation, their custody would not be required any further.

5. Per contra, the learned counsel for the SVU has opposed the application for bail by way of filing of a counter affidavit on the ground that there is substantial material against the petitioner showing huge disproportionate assets and further that the petitioner did not cooperate during the investigation and he only surrendered after coercive processes under Section 82 of the Cr.P.C. was initiated against him.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances and also not losing sight of the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the past six months and charge-sheet



has already been submitted, no useful purpose would be served by keeping the petitioner behind bars as held in the case of **Sanjay Chandra** (supra) and further considering that the petitioner continues to remain in the constructive custody of the court to be in attendance whenever his presence is required, let the above named petitioner, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Special Case No. 06 of 2025 arising out of S.V.U. P.S. Case No. 02 of 2025, subject to the conditions that the petitioner shall appear on each and every date till conclusion of trial and if the petitioner does not appear on two consecutive dates without any substantial and satisfactory reason, the learned court concerned and the S.V.U. would be at liberty to take steps towards cancellation of his bail bonds.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

devendra/-

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

