

[2025:JHHC:18499]

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
B.A. No.5589 of 2025

Roshan Kumar Chaturvedi @ Sonu, aged about 32 years, son of
Ram Kumar Chaturvedy, Resident of Qtr No.688, Street-13,
Section 9B, Bokaro Steel City, P.O. and P.S.- Harla, District-
Bokaro

.... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Jharkhand

.... Opposite Party

CORAM : HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR CHOUDHARY

For the Petitioner : Mr. Rohan Mazumdar, Advocate

For the State : Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P

Order No.02 Dated- 09-07-2025

Heard the parties.

The petitioner has been made accused in connection with C.I.D. P.S. Case No.43 of 2024 registered under Sections 318 (4), 316 (5), 338, 336 (3), 340 (1), 340 (2), 61 (2) and 111 (4) of the B.N.S., 2023.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was one of the co-conspirators who embezzled Government money to the tune of Rs.9,00,00,000/- in Canara Bank, Nift Branch on the basis of forged KYC Documents by opening fake account. It is submitted that the allegation against the petitioner is false. It is further submitted that the petitioner is also involved in another case of similar nature which involved fraudulent withdrawal of Rs.10,40,47,946/-; by opening fake account in the name of Jharkhand Tourism Development Corporation Limited on the basis of forged documents. It is next submitted that the petitioner has been implicated in this case only on the basis of confessional statement of the co-accused person. It is also submitted that no offence as alleged, is made out against the petitioner. It is lastly submitted that the petitioner has been in custody since 17.04.2025. Hence it is submitted that the petitioner be released on bail.

Learned P.P. appearing for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for bail and submits that keeping in view that huge amount of money has been embezzled by the petitioner being a member of an organized crime syndicate and the criminal antecedent of the petitioner of being involved in similar offence, there is every chance of the petitioner absconding and tampering with the evidence if released on bail. It is, therefore, submitted that the petitioner ought not be released on bail at this stage.

Considering the serious nature of allegation against the petitioner as well as the chance of absconding and tampering with the evidence, this Court is of the considered view that this is not a fit case where the above-named petitioner be released on bail. Accordingly, the prayer for bail of the above-named petitioner is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Choudhary, J.)