

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88033 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-64 Year-2025 Thana- MITHANPURA District- Muzaffarpur

Sanjay Kumar Son of Late Ramdeo Prasad Yadav Resident of Village-
Rampur Bheriyahi, P.S.- Kanti, District- Muzaffarpur, Proprietor of Sanjay
Enterprises, Kolhua Paigambarpur, Bairiya, P.S.- Kanti, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vaishnavi Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 18-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4),
338, 336(3), 340(2), 61(2) of the B.N.S.S.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case but then was acquitted in
the trial and the informant alleges that Saket Ranjan along with
the petitioner, based on fake signature of the Headmaster of the
concerned school on bills related to submersible boring, bench
and desk etc. obtained payment.
4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case without



holding a proper inquiry. It is next submitted that had petitioner been given an opportunity of explaining his side of the case perhaps the instant FIR would not have been instituted. It is also submitted that petitioner had completed the work and had requested the Headmaster to submit the bill as per departmental order. It is further submitted that it was the Headmaster who submitted the bill but in the FIR it is being alleged that based on fake bills, the payment was obtained. It is also submitted that Saket Ranjan had approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.54778 of 2025 and the same came to be allowed by an order dated 03.09.2025. It is also submitted that petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence.

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

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case



is pending/successor court in connection with Mithanpura
P.S.Case No.64/2025, subject to the conditions as laid down
under Section 482(2) B.N.S.S.

7. However, it is made clear that in the event if the
Investigating Officer of the case files an application before the
learned trial court bringing to its notice that the petitioner
despite giving assurance to this court is not co-operating in the
investigation in that event the learned trial court shall be at
liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

