

**IN THE COURT OF SRI DEEPAK KUMAR-I, ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- II-CUM-SPECIAL
JUDGE (VIGILANCE), BHAGALPUR**

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 862/2026

(Arising out of **Vigilance P.S. Case No. 06/2026**)

U/s 7 (a) of P.C. Act.

Manoj Kumar, aged about 32 years, S/o Upendra Sahni, R/o village Berua, P.S. Gaighat, District Muzaffarpur

.....**Petitioner**

Versus

The State of Bihar

.....**Opp. Party**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Ld. Advocate.

For the State : Mr. Ram Badan Rai Choudhary, Ld. Spl. P.P.

Date of order	Order with signature of the court
1	2
05-06-2026	This is a petition filed on behalf of the above named accused-petitioner for grant of anticipatory bail who apprehension his arrest in connection with Vigilance P.S. Case No. 06/2026 for offences punishable U/s 7 (a) of Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. On behalf of the petitioner a certificate has been given in bail petition that earlier no anticipatory or regular bail petition has been filed on his behalf either before the Court of the Ld. Principal Sessions Judge, Bhagalpur or before the Hon'ble High Court, Patna. At para-3 of bail petition, accused-petitioner has given certificate that he has no criminal antecedent. Prosecution case, as per complain of the complainant Shailendra Kumar Singh, in brief, is that her wife has purchased a piece of land on 25.10.2024 from Amarnath Singh measuring 1.664 Decimal, Khata No. 370 and Khesra No. 1399 and the Jamabandi of said land is in the name of his mother Suryakala Devi bearing Khesra No. 133 & 1406. Thereafter, he has tried to file online application which was not accepted because of less Rakwa of said land. Thereafter, he met with Circle employee Manoj Kumar and told about the matter. Thereafter, Manoj Kumar reached at his home and stated that other Khesra is also attached and will be upgraded in said land for mutation. On 06.01.2026 he has given an application in Circle Office Bhagwanpur and in the evening Manoj Kumar demanded Rs. 3,500/- as bribe for doing the said work. Complainant does not want give bribe. Hence, this FIR is lodged. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence and has falsely been implicated in this case. It has further been submitted that in the instant case the complainant, Shailendra Kumar Singh failed to file any online application for mutation and when there is no application on the official portal, there is no official act or public duty pending before the petitioner and the allegation of bribe demand for non-existent file is a figment of imagination and a legal impossibility and the role of petitioner (Revenue Employee) is limited and no recovery of any bribe money or incriminating documents from the petitioner and

**IN THE COURT OF SRI DEEPAK KUMAR-I, ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE- II-CUM-SPECIAL
JUDGE (VIGILANCE), BHAGALPUR**

Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 862/2026
(Arising out of **Vigilance P.S. Case No. 06/2026**)
U/s 7 (a) of P.C. Act.

Contd...P/2 05-06-2026	without previous approval of Competent Authority, no police officer shall conduct any enquiry or investigation into any offence alleged to have been committed by a public servant where the alleged offence is relatable to any recommendation made or decision taken by such public servant in discharge of his official duty. On such basis, it has been prayed that the petitioner be enlarged on anticipatory bail. On the other hand, learned Special Public Prosecutor of vigilance opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner. Heard both the parties. Perused the case record. After perusal of the case record and copy of Pen Drive of voice of this accused-petitioner, it is evident that there is allegation against this accused-petitioner that he demanded bribe from the informant in the name of mutation. I heard pen drive which shows that the allegation levelled against the accused-petitioner is found to be true. Para-5 of the case diary is the re-statement of informant who reiterated the prosecution case. Para-8 of the case diary is the conversation between complainant/informant. Para- 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 20, 28 , 36, 59, 65 of the case diary are the statements of witnesses who have also supported the allegation levelled against this accused-petitioner. Further, investigation is still pending against this accused-petitioner. Keeping in view the nature of the offence, complicity of the accused person, severity of punishment and submissions of the learned counsel for the parties, the allegation against the petitioner is serious in nature. So, I am of the view that applicant/petitioner does not deserve for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby Rejected. Sd/- Additional Sessions Judge-II-cum- Special Judge (Vigilance), Bhagalpur
---------------------------	--