

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 4654 of 2025 (Doriganj P.S. Case No. 249/2025)

Rabi Kumar V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

S.No.	Date	Contents	Remarks
01	10.03.2026	<p>1. Heard learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused as well as learned Public Prosecutor representing the State on anticipatory bail petition of petitioner-accused, namely, Rabi Kumar, apprehending his arrest in this Doriganj P.S. Case No. 249/2025, registered under Sections 420, 409, 504 and 506 of IPC.</p> <p>2. FIR of this case has been registered on the basis of a typed application of the informant, namely, <i>Sanjay Kumar Singh</i>, stating that Bihar Education Department sent Rs. 1,67,500/- in the account of <i>High School, Kajipur</i>, Saran for purchase of goods and articles related to business education. That amount was given to the petitioner-accused by the Headmaster of the School, and after receiving the amount, the petitioner-accused did not provide any educational goods and articles and has fled away with that amount. Thereafter, the informant repeatedly asked the petitioner-accused to provide the educational articles, upon which the petitioner-accused abused him and threaten him that he would implicate them all in a case under the SC/ST Act.</p> <p>3. It is contended on behalf of learned counsel representing the petitioner-accused that the he is quite innocent and has not committed any offence as alleged in F.I.R. Next contended that earlier one A.B.P. No. 3263/2025 filed on behalf of this petitioner-accused was dismissed for default <i>vide</i> order dated 31.10.2025 by this Court and except that, no ABP or regular bail has been filed on behalf of the petitioner-accused in this Court or Hon'ble High Court, Patna in connection with the present case. The petitioner-accused has got clean antecedent. Next added that the petitioner-accused is not the custodian of the school's account or school money; only the Headmaster is responsible of any amount related to school fund. Next added that the petitioner-accused is a vendor of school. He neither drew any money from the school's account nor any school money was entrusted to him by the Headmaster. Next contended that there is no any documentary proof of money entrustment to this petitioner-accused and this case has been filed by the Headmaster to save his skin from the defalcation case who is only responsible to gain and loss of the school's amount. Further submitted that the petitioner-accused is ready to furnish sureties as required by the Court. Therefore, it is prayed that the petitioner-accused may be enlarged on anticipatory bail.</p> <p>4. Per contra, learned Public Prosecutor representing the State vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the</p>	

In the Court of **Puneet Kumar Garg**, Sessions Judge, Saran at Chapra
Anticipatory Bail Petition No. 4654 of 2025 (Doriganj P.S. Case No. 249/2025)

Rabi Kumar V/s State of Bihar

ORDER

	<p>petitioner-accused.</p> <p>5. Heard both the sides and perused the relevant materials available on record. From the same, it appears that the FIR of this case has been lodged after a delay of about two years and no plausible explanation for such delay has been given by the informant. Furthermore, from the nature of allegation, the dispute appears to be predominantly of commercial nature.</p> <p>6. So, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and the reasons mentioned herein-above, this Anticipatory Bail Petition, bearing No. 4654 of 2025, is hereby allowed. In the event of his arrest or surrender within one month from this order, the petitioner-accused, namely, Rabi Kumar, be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 50,000/- <u>with two sureties</u> of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court concerned subject to the conditions as laid down u/s 482(2) of B.N.S.S., 2023 :-</p> <p>(I) That the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by I.O., as and when required,</p> <p>(II) That the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to the I.O. of the case,</p> <p>(III) That the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court,</p> <p>(IV) That the petitioner is directed to co-operate in trial and disposal of the case.</p> <p>(V) That the Bailor(s) must be the <u>close-relative(s)</u> of the petitioner-accused.</p> <p>[Dictated]</p> <p>(Puneet Kumar Garg), Sessions Judge, Saran 10.03.2026</p>	