

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.91959 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-49 Year-2025 Thana- Cyber P.S. District- Rohtas

Satish Kumar Choudhary S/O Janardan Chodhary R/O Village- Dhanpurwa,
P.S- Ara Nagar, Distt.- Bhojpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Harendra Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-01-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Rohtas (Cyber) P.S. Case No. 49 of 2025, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 303(2), 319(2) of the BNS, 2023 and Sections 66(C), 66(D) of IT Act, 2008.

3. The case of the prosecution, in short, as per the informant that he learnt from a Youtube ad Video that SPRINT999 is an application where money can be earned by playing games. It is further alleged that he sent a message “Hii” on WhatsApp from the number received from that game where he got a link where the informant sent Rs.40,11,744.96/- from his account number and from seventeen account numbers of his friend. It is further alleged that the informant received 2,00,000/- in his account at the very outset but after a certain point of time the returns stopped coming in his account and the informant tried to contact on that mobile number but he did not



get response and he suspected a cyber fraud. It is also alleged that the informant received threatening messages thereafter.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent. The entire prosecution story is false, fabricated and concocted. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that from perusal of FIR it is apparent that petitioner has no role in the transaction of any money. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated as he is said to be owner of mobile phone which is used for threatening the informant to manage the case.

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

6. From the perusal of the allegations levelled in the FIR it is manifest that the petitioner has been alleged to have committed serious offence, and therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

(Alok Kumar Sinha, J)

Gaurav Sinha/-

U			
---	--	--	--

