

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI**ABA No.5328 of 2025**

Binod Paswan, aged about 40 years, Son of Late Niranjana Paswan,
Resident of Mohali Chuwan, Koldiha, Giridih, P.O. P.S.-Giridih, District
Giridih Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opp. Party

with

ABA No.5466 of 2025

Ajay Kumar Mandal, aged about 38 years, son of Binod Mandal,
resident of Nagarkiyari, P.O. and P.S. Barwadda, District Dhanbad,
Jharkhand. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ... Opp. Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners	:	Mr. Anand Kumar Sinha, Advocate Mr. Zaid Ahmad, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Priya Shrestha, Spl. P.P. through V.C. Mr. Pankaj Kumar, P.P. (Advocates in respective cases)

2/13.11.2025 Heard learned counsel appearing on behalf of Petitioners in their respective cases and learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State in their respective cases.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Tundi P.S. Case No. 123 of 2020, registered for the offences under Sections 409, 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120-B and 34 of the Indian Penal Code, pending in the Court of Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Dhanbad.

3. Md. Zaid Ahmed, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in ABA No.5466 of 2025 submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case and the false allegations are made of involving the petitioner in releasing the scholarship amount to more persons on forged identity. He further submits that the petitioner was only the computer operator and he was working only on the instruction of the

senior officials and he also submits that the OTP and password for the transaction was not being delivered to the petitioner. On the basis of that he submits that the anticipatory bail may kindly be granted.

4. Mr. Anand Kr. Sinha, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in ABA No.5328 of 2025 submits that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he submits and ongoing process like KYC etc. is to be submitted with computer operator by the concerned Principal / Nodal Officer and after obtaining O.T.P. from the concerned District Welfare Officer, and scrutinizing KYC, I/D was provided. In view of that, the petitioner was having no role. He also submits that petitioner's suspension has already been revoked and he has joined the duty.

5. Learned counsel appearing for the State in both the cases have jointly submitted that both the petitioners were involved in the said process and the role of the petitioners have been disclosed in paragraph No. 67 and 77 of case diary. They jointly submitted that the allegations are there that scholarship amount was meant for 44 students and 288 forged persons have been paid. She submits that this allegation is only for one school, however, other schools are also there. In view of that anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

6. Looking into the contents of the Paragraph No. 67 and 77 of the case diary, it transpires that the petitioners are also there in verifying the name of the persons to release the scholarship amount. Not only the petitioners, the other officers are also involved in the said process and further considering that the parameters of the criminal case and

the departmental proceeding are different and in view of the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner in ABA No.5328 of 2025 is not being accepted by the Court. In the attending facts and circumstances of these cases, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. These Anticipatory Bail Application are accordingly dismissed and disposed of.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

13.11.2025
R.Kumar