

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.2923 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-214 Year-2020 Thana- DANAPUR District- Patna

-
1. Raj Kumar Sinha S/o- Late Sheo Shankar Sinha Village- Sheo Shankar Niwas, Bank Colony, Gola Road, Danapur Cant PS- Danapur @ Dnapapur, Dist- Patna
 2. Poonam Sinha W/o- Raj Kumar Sinha Village- Sheo Shankar Niwas, Bank Colony, Gola Road, Danapur Cant PS- Danapur @ Dnapapur,, Dist- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Branch Manager, ICICI Bank Ltd. Regional Processing Centre, Veena Niwas Patliputra Path, Rajendra Nagar, Road No-10G, Ps- Kadamkuan Dist- Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Mritunjay Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Binod Kumar, APP
For the Bank	:	Mr. Dhananjay Kashyap, Advocate

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE PRABHAT KUMAR SINGH
ORAL ORDER

5 22-04-2026 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners, learned APP appearing on behalf of the State and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the Bank/Opposite Party No. 2.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 467, 468, 471, 419, 420, 406, 120B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. As per prosecution case, it is alleged that both these



petitioners obtained O.D. loan of about Rs. 42,00,000/- from I.C.I.C.I. Bank under the Rural Business Credit Scheme against a property owned by Petitioner No. 2 and thereafter, they failed to repay the loan and interest and absconded without payment. It is further alleged that later on, it was discovered that the mortgaged property had already been sold to a third party.

4. It is submitted by learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioners that petitioners are quite innocent and have committed no offence. Petitioners have falsely been implicated in this case due to commercial dispute with the Bank. Petitioners claim clean antecedents.

5. On the other hand, learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the Bank have vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and submitted that petitioners are named in the F.I.R. and there is specific accusation that these two petitioners took O.D. loan facility from the Bank in the year 2016-17 keeping a property as guarantee and thereafter, absconded the repayments and also sold the mortgaged land illegally.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and specific and direct nature of accusation, the prayer for grant



of anticipatory bail to the petitioners is rejected.

(Prabhat Kumar Singh, J)

shashank/-

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

