

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90835 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-140 Year-2024 Thana- NATWAR District- Rohtas

=====

Amit Kumar @ Sanjay Kumar @ Verma Jee, Son of Ramashray Singh, R/o
Village - Sisirit Tola(Keshav Singh Tola), P.S. - Dharampura, Dist. - Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Uday Shankar Choudhary, Adv. Mr. Adarsh, Adv. Mr. Amitesh Kumar, Adv.
For the O.P. No. 2	:	Mr. Sagar Suman, Adv. Mr. Ranjeev Ranjan, Adv. Mr. Surya Swetabh, Adv.
For the State	:	Mr. Md. Matloob Rab, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 11-02-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Natwar P.S. Case No. 140 of 2024, dated 14.08.2024, instituted for the offences under Sections 406, 420 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Sections 336(3), 338, 340(2) and 341(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 (B.N.S.) were added later on.



3. The allegation against the petitioner is that he had duped the informant for almost rupees two crores.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he has falsely been implicated in this case merely on suspicion. It has been submitted that the transactions, which have been shown in the F.I.R., does not relate to the petitioner rather it has been attributed in the name of other persons and a firm. It has also been submitted that the petitioner is not an employee of the F.C.I. and it has wrongly been stated in the F.I.R. that he is an employee of the F.C.I. and on such presumption, he has falsely been implicated in this case. It has been admitted that though the petitioner has six criminal antecedents against his name, but in the present case he is in custody since 18.09.2025.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant submits that the petitioner has not only defrauded the informant of his valuable money, but he has also played mischief with the organization like the F.C.I. It has further been submitted that it is a case of impersonation and the petitioner projecting himself to be an employee of the F.C.I. and has duped the informant. It has also been submitted that the petitioner had been instrumental in getting the amounts deposited in the third party account(s) and, in fact, he is the main conspirator.



6. The learned Addl. Public Prosecutor for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail.

7. Considering the aforesaid submissions and taking into account the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner as also his criminal antecedents, I am not inclined to grant him bail.

8. The prayer for grant of bail of the petitioner is, accordingly, rejected.

9. However, the petitioner is at liberty to approach this Court for grant of bail, as and when advised.

10. The application stands dismissed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

