

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82282 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-17 Year-2025 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

Swati Chaurasiya Daughter of Ashok Kumar Chaurasiya Resident of 114,
Pradhanpura Ward No 9, PO And PS -Jatra District -Tikamgarh, Madhya
Pradesh

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through Vigilance Patna Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Akash Shankar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rana Vikram Singh, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

4 18-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned APP

for the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the

Vigilance.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offence punishable under Section 7 of P.C. Act and section 61(2)
of the B.N.S., 2023.

3. The allegation in the First Information Report is
that the petitioner demanded Rs. 1,00,000/- as bribe from the
complainant for the work relating to ancestral land of the
complainant.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has clean antecedent and has falsely been implicated
in this case. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is a
Land Survey Officer and the allegation upon her is that she
along with one Survey Amin had demanded bribe of Rs.
1,00,000/- and subsequently reduced to Rs. 80,000/- and was



caught red handed with currency note of Rs. 50,000/-. It is further submitted that the allegation of demand are not correct and the entire transaction of money and the process of trap is stage managed with the independent witnesses. It has further been submitted that the petitioner is in custody since 14.08.2025 who has no criminal antecedent and charge-sheet has been submitted on 10.10.2025. Further, despite lapse of so many days even after submission of charge-sheet, the prosecution has not produced the sanction order against the petitioner as a result of which neither cognizance has been taken nor any progress has been made in the trial. Further, the charge-sheet indicates that there are as many as 10 prosecution witnesses and hence there would be no likelihood of conclusion of trial in near future even if the trial commences. Similarly situated co-accused person, namely, Ravi Raj has already been grant bail by the Court of Vigilance vide order dated 04.12.2025 passed in Spl. Case No. 47 of 2025.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Vigilance however opposes the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner was arrested on the spot and all norms of a trap case have been followed, as such she doesn't deserve to be released on bail.



6. Besides above-mentioned facts and circumstances, it is taken into consideration that the petitioner is in custody and charge-sheet has been submitted, coupled with the fact that the petitioner has clean antecedent and till date sanction order has also not been produced by the prosecution. Considering that there is no likelihood of conclusion of trial in near future, as such, no useful purpose would be served by keeping her behind the bar especially in view of the fact that similarly situated co-accused person has also been granted bail by the Court of Vigilance, let the petitioner, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (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 SUV P.S. Case No. 17 of 2025, subject to the following conditions:-

(i). The petitioner shall remain physically present in court on each and every date during trial and in the event of failure on two consecutive dates without sufficient reasons, his bail bonds shall be liable to be cancelled by the learned court concerned.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

Ranjeet/-

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

