

In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.

Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi

M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)

	Dev Narayan Murmu Petitioner Versus The State of Jharkhand Opposite Party Counsel for the petitioner : Sri Shyam Sundar Singh, Ld. Advocate Counsel for the State (CID) : Md. Khushbuddin Ali, Ld. Add.P.P.
18.06.2026	1. Regular bail petition being Misc Criminal Application 1168 of 2026 filed on behalf of Dev Narayan Murmu, petitioner who is in custody since 27.04.2026 in connection with C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026 registered u/s 316(2)/316(5)/318(4)/338/336(3)/340(2)/61(2) of BNS and 66 r/w 43(a)(b)(d)(g)(h)(i)(j)/66(C)(D) of I.T. Act pending in this court is put up for hearing. 2. Both the parties have been heard. 3. Brief facts of the case are that the informant Sumit Kumar presently working as District Treasury Officer, West Singhbhum, Chaibasa, submits that vide Letter No. KOA0VI0NI0/KOA0SA0-(2)-17/2026-224/Ranchi dated 20.04.2026 issued by the Finance Department (Directorate of Treasuries and Institutional Finance), Government of Jharkhand, Ranchi, directions were received from the Office of the Principal Accountant General, Jharkhand, Ranchi. It is further submitted that during the review of the IFMS data, it was found that under DDO Code SGH/POL/002 of the Superintendent of Police, West Singhbhum, Chaibasa, certain bank accounts had been made “multiple payee” accounts and transactions amounting to Rs. 26,21,717/- had been

Contd. .2

In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.

Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi

M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)

18.06.2026	reflected over the past few years. Directions were issued to investigate the matter thoroughly and take necessary action. Accordingly, by Memo No. 767(B)/R dated 23.04.2026 issued by the office of the Deputy Commissioner, West Singhbhum, Chaibasa, a joint inquiry team was constituted. The team included senior district and police officials. It is further submitted that on 25.04.2026, the inquiry team visited the Accounts Branch of the Office concerned under DDO Code SGH/POL/002 and physically verified the records and statements produced by the concerned DDO and accounting staff. Examination of the transactions mentioned in the data supplied by the Accountant General revealed unauthorized withdrawals from the following SBI accounts :- (1) SBI Potka, East Singhbhum – Account No. 31285896907, (2) SBI Tagore Hill, Morabadi, Account No. 37885151142, (3) SBI Chaibasa – Account No. 33913184180 and (4) SBI Bahalada, Mayurbhanj, Odisha – Account No. 41378095759. The inquiry team found that both soft copies and hard copies of the relevant documents are mismatched. During the investigation, it was found that Dev Narayan Murmu (constable - 1184), was posted in the Accounts Branch of the office of the Superintendent of Police, West Singhbhum, had allegedly misused the above accounts and facilitated unauthorized withdrawal of government funds. The details of the accounts and the periods during which the transactions occurred are listed in the report :-
Contd... 3	

In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.
Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi
M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)

18.06.2026					
	Sl. No.	Account No.	IFS Code	Name of Bank	Tenure
	1.	31285896907	SBIN0006444	SBI, Potka	Sep 2017 to May 2022
	2.	37885151142	SBIN0016002	SBI, Tagore Hill, Morabadi	Sep 2018 to Feb 2023
	3.	33913184180	SBIN0000052	SBI, Chaibasa	Feb 2021 to Oct 2024
	4.	41378095759	SBIN0012050	SBI, Bahalada	Oct 2024 to May 2025
Contd... 4	The inquiry further revealed prima-facie involvement of Dev Narayan Murmu in tampering with official records, manipulating computerized data and fraudulently withdrawing government money. It was also found that by abusing his official position and in collusion with the account holders, he allegedly forged documents and misappropriated government funds with dishonest intention. Hence this FIR.				
	4. Appearing on behalf of the petitioner the Learned Counsel submitted that the petitioner is innocent, has not committed offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is not named in the FIR and no specific allegation has been levelled against him in the entire prosecution story. The FIR itself reveals that the allegations are based upon treasury records, computer generated data, bank accounts and departmental documents and therefore the entire case is documentary in nature. No recovery of alleged government amount has been made from the conscious possession of the petitioner. No forged				

In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.

Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi

M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)

18.06.2026	seal, forged cheque, forged document or illegal instrument has been recovered from the petitioner. The prosecution has failed to establish any direct nexus between the petitioner and alleged withdrawal of amount. The mere naming of the petitioner in FIR cannot by itself be ground to deny liberty when substantive evidence is yet to be tested during trial. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent and has never been convicted in any criminal case prior to the present matter. The petitioner has remained in judicial custody for considerable period. The continued incarceration of the petitioner would amount to pretrial punishment. The investigation in the present case is substantially documentary in nature and therefore custodial detention of petitioner is no longer necessary. All alleged documents, bank statements, digital records and official files are already within custody of investigating agency and therefore there remains no possibility of tampering with evidence. The petitioner has fully cooperated during investigation and undertakes to continue cooperating during trial. The petitioner undertakes not to influence prosecution witnesses or tamper with evidence in any manner whatsoever. Trial in the present case is likely to take substantial time for conclusion and therefore prolonged detention would seriously prejudice the fundamental rights guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in Dataram Singh Vs. State of Uttarpradesh, reported in (2018) 3 SCC
Contd... 5	22, has categorically held that grant of bail is a rule whereas refusal is an

In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.

Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi

M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)

18.06.2026	exception and presumption of innocence operates in favour of accused till conclusion of trial. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in Sanjay Chandra Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation, reported in (2012) 1 SCC 40, observed that object of bail is neither punitive nor preventive and detention before conviction should not become punishment. In paragraph 21 of Sanjay Chandra Vs. CBI (supra), the Hon’ble Apex Court held that deprivation of liberty must be considered punishment unless required for securing presence of accused during trial. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in Arnesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar, reported in (2014) 8 SCC 273, strongly deprecated unnecessary arrests and emphasized protection of personal liberty guaranteed under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in Satender Kumar Antil Vs. CBI & Another, reported in (2022) 10 SCC 51, reiterated that courts should lean towards liberty particularly in cases based upon documentary evidence. The Hon’ble Supreme Court in Gudikanti Narasimhulu Vs. Public Prosecutor, High Court of Andhra Pradesh, reported in (1978) 1 SCC 240, held that personal liberty cannot be curtailed casually and bail jurisprudence must be interpreted in favour of freedom. The allegations against the petitioner are yet to be proved during full fledged trial and therefore continued detention serves no fruitful purpose. The petitioner is ready to furnish adequate bail bonds and sureties to the satisfaction of this Court. The
Contd... 6	

In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.

Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi

M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)

18.06.2026	balance of convenience lies in favour of grant of bail. 5. 5. Opposing the bail application, the Learned Additional Public Prosecutor argued that the petitioner is accused of a multi-year, planned economic scam that targets the public exchequer. Economic offences constitute a class apart as they damage the financial health of the state. The petitioner used his privileged access inside the police department's Accounts Branch to execute digital fraud, breaking the public trust reposed in a uniformed officer. The investigation is at an extremely crucial stage. The C.I.D. is actively tracking down the final beneficiaries and uncovering the rest of the siphoning network. Releasing the petitioner now could derail the financial tracking and compromise key civilian witnesses. 6. I have carefully evaluated the rival submissions in light of the materials available in the case diary. The primary issue before this Court is whether the petitioner is entitled to regular bail given the nature of the allegations and the current stage of the investigation. 7. It is a well-settled legal principle that economic offenses constitute a distinct class of crime. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in <i>Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy v. CBI (2013) 7 SCC 439</i> held that economic offenses have deep-rooted conspiracies and involve a heavy loss to public funds, needing to be viewed with a stern approach. The court observed that the economic health of the country is compromised by such actions, and
Contd... 7	

**In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.
Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi
M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)**

18.06.2026	therefore, bail should not be granted casually in matters involving systematic manipulation of public monies. 8. In the present case, the allegations against the petitioner are exceptionally grave. He was not a bystander but a public servant (a police constable) posted inside the sensitive Accounts Branch of the Office of the Superintendent of Police. He allegedly held a position of trust, which he is accused of abusing continuously for nearly eight years (from 2017 to 2025) to perpetrate institutional fraud. The mismatch between physical ledgers and digital logs highlights a deliberate, deeply structured plan to siphon off ₹26,21,717/- from the public exchequer. While the Learned Counsel for the petitioner argued that the case is entirely documentary and the petitioner has been in custody since 27.04.2026, this court cannot overlook the fact that the investigation is being conducted by a specialized agency (C.I.D.) and is currently at a critical stage. The siphoning chain involves multiple private bank accounts spread across different districts and even an adjacent state (Odisha). The tracking of the money trail, identifying co-conspirators, and establishing the identity of the ultimate beneficiaries are tasks that are actively unfolding. Releasing the petitioner at this juncture creates a real risk of data tampering, witness intimidation, and collusion with un-arrested co-accused to delete digital footprints. 9. The gravity of the offence, the long duration over which the fraud
Contd...8	

**In the Court of Shri Kuldeep, Addl. Judicial Commissioner – XVIII, Cum spl.
Judge CID/ATS, Ranchi
M.C.A No. 1168/2026 (C.I.D P.S. Case No. 07/2026)**

18.06.2026	was actively carried out, the systematic abuse of an official position within a law enforcement agency, and the potential impact on the ongoing financial tracing heavily outweigh the arguments for personal liberty at this stage of the proceedings. 10. Considering the gravity of the offence, the nature of the financial evidence linking the petitioner to the siphoned government funds, and the potential impact on the ongoing investigation, this Court does not find it safe or proper to enlarge the petitioner on bail at this stage. Resultantly, the prayer for regular bail made on behalf of the petitioner, Dev Narayan Murmu, stands rejected. Accordingly, Misc. Criminal Application No. 1168 of 2026 stands disposed of. Let an authenticated copy of this order be handed over to the Ld. Counsel of the petitioner free of cost. (Dictated) Sd/ (Kuldeep) Addl. Judicial Commissioner -XVIII, Cum spl. Judge CID, Ranchi JO Code JH00572 Uploaded on 19.06.2026