IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.44248 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2008 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Patna

---

1. Manoj Kumar Singh Son of Ravindra Singh Presently Residing at Kaju Bagan, Hehal, Ratu Road, P.S. Pandra, District Ranchi, State of Jharkhand, and formerly residing at Anand Vihar Colony, Bailey Road, P.S. Rukanpura, District Patna, State of Bihar.
2. Vijay Pratap Singh S/o Ravindra Singh Presently Residing at Kaju Bagan, Hehal, Ratu Road, P.S. Pandra, District Ranchi, State of Jharkhand, and formerly residing at Anand Vihar Colony, Bailey Road, P.S. Rukanpura, District Patna, State of Bihar.

... ... Petitioners

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The Central Bureau of Investigation through the Superintendent of Police, Anti-Corruption Branch Bihar
3. The UCO Bank, through its Zonal Manager, Zonal Office, Patna, Bihar. Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

---

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 44092 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-2008 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Patna

---

Mani Devi @ Raj Mani Singh Wife of Manoj Kumar Singh Resident of Kaju Bagan, Hehal, Ratu Road, P.S.- Pandra, District- Ranchi, State- Jharkhand formerly resident of Anand Vihar colony, Bailey Road, P.S.- Rukanpura, Distt.- Patna, Bihar.

... ... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. The state of Bihar through the Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, Anti-Corruption Branch, Patna, Bihar
3. The UCO Bank, Through its Zonal Manager, zonal office, Patna, Bihar bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 44248 of 2026)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. P.N. Shahi, Sr. Advocate
		Mr. Amit Anand, Advocate
For the UCO Bank	:	Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Pandey, Advocate
For the C.B.I.	:	Mr. Sanjay Kumar, SC CBI
For the State	:	Mr. Nityanand, A.P.P.

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 44092 of 2026)

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. P.N. Shahi, Sr. Advocate

		Mr. Amit Anand, Advocate
		Md. Deep Shekhar, Advocate
For the informant	:	Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Pandey, Advocate
		Mr. Sanjay Kumar, SC CBI
For the State	:	Mr. Nagendra Prasad, A.P.P.

==

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

6 27-08-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners, learned counsel for the UCO Bank, learned counsel for the CBI and Learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. Both the aforesaid applications arise in connection with R.C. No. 0232008A0019 dated 29.08.2008, corresponding to Split-up Special Case no. 33(A) of 2011, arising out of R.C. No. 19(A) of 2008, instituted for the offences under Sections 120B, 420, 467, 468 and 471 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 13(2) read with Section 13(1)(d) of the Prevention of Corruption Act, 1988. Therefore, both the aforesaid applications have been heard together and are being disposed of by this common order.

3. The Prosecution case, in short, is that the then Senior Managers of UCO Bank, Patliputra Industrial Area Branch, namely Shri J.C. Nandi and Shri D.C. Jain, in conspiracy with the Directors of M/s Shivam Planners & Constructions Pvt. Ltd., namely, Manoj Kumar Singh, Vijay Pratap Singh (Petitioners in Criminal Miscellaneous No.44248 of 2026) and Mani Devi (Petitioner Criminal Miscellaneous

No.44092 of 2026) along with empanelled valuer(s) and legal advisor, dishonestly facilitated sanction and subsequent enhancement of a cash credit limit from Rs. 80 lakhs to Rs. 2.80 crores. As per the prosecution case, the initial sanction of Rs. 80 lakhs in February 2004 was secured against a collateral property situated at Mouza Jalalpur, Danapur, which was later found to be Government land in 2007, having no realizable value. Thereafter, the credit limit was enhanced to Rs. 2 crores in march 2005 on the basis of additional collateral properties at Rukunpura and Danapur, which allegedly turned out to be supported by forged and fake title deeds. Subsequently, the limit was further enhanced to Rs. 2.80 crores in 2006 based on additional properties located in District Nalanda, which were projected as commercial in nature and highly valued by approved valuers. However, on verification, these properties were found to be agricultural land with significantly lower valuation than originally assessed. It is further alleged that the bank officials abused their official position by relying upon inflated valuation reports and questionable legal opinion, thereby extending undue financial benefit to the borrower company. The loan account eventually became a Non-Performing Asset (NPA) on 31.12.2007, with an outstanding liability of approximately Rs. 317 MIV crores (excluding interest), resulting in wrongful loss to the Bank.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have falsely been implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that after investigation, the Charge-sheet has already been submitted in this case. He further submitted that petitioners are private individuals and they are neighter public servants nor officials of the Bank. The entire process of appraisal, verification, valuation, legal scrutiny and sanction of the credit facilities was undertaken by the competent officials of UCO Bank. He also submitted that petitioners had no role whatsoever in the preparation of such valuation reports, legal opinions or in the internal decision-making process leading to sanction and enhancement of the credit facilities. He further submitted that the uncle of the petitioners was managing the family business and related affairs and after his demise the petitioners had no knowledge regarding the status of the company or the proceedings connected therewith. He also submits that petitioners are ready to liquidate the outstanding amount, if so permitted by the concerned Bank and accepted by the competent forum. The counsel lastly submitted that the petitioners in

Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44248 of 2026 are in custody since 01.04.2026 and they have no criminal antecedents, whereas petitioner in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44092 of 2026 is in custody since 01.04.2026 and she has no criminal antecedents. The counsel for the petitioner in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44092 of 2026 undertakes to pay Rs. One Crore to the bank within a year.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State and learned counsel for the informant, vehemently, opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners. Learned counsel for the CBI, vehemently, opposed the prayer for grant of bail and submitted that the petitioners are directors of the company and the petitioners knowingly and willfully defrauded the bank by presenting falsified financial statements with the intent to induce the bank into approving the loan and enhancing the credit limit. The counsel for the bank submitted that the petitioners obtained credit through material misrepresentation, constituting a deliberate fraud upon the bank.

6. Having heard the parties, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, taking into account the fact that Charge-sheet has already been submitted and keeping in view the Judgment of the Hon’ble Apex Court in the case of

Satender Kumar Antil Vs. Central Bureau of Investigation and Anr. (2026 INSC 115) which emphasizes that the Courts must consider a woman's socio-economic realities and vulnerabilities, such as being a primary caregiver or the harsh impact of incarceration on dependent children, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner Mani Devi @ Raj Mani Singh (Petitioner in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44092 of 2026).

7. Let the petitioner Mani Devi @ Raj Mani Singh (Petitioner in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44092 of 2026) be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection with R.C. No. 0232008A0019 dated 29.08.2008, corresponding to Split-up Special Case no. 33(A) of 2011, arising out of R.C. No. 19(A) of 2008, subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be the petitioner's own or close member. The petitioner will deposit a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- (Rs. Ten Lakh) to the informant/Bank at the time of execution of the bail bond and the remaining amount of Rs. 90 Lakhs will be paid by the petitioner in five equal installments within a period of one year.

(II) The petitioner shall appear on each and every date fixed during the trial and shall not remain absent on two consecutive dates without sufficient cause.

(III) The petitioner shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence/intimidate any witness during the course of trial.

In case of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioner.

8. So far as bail application of the petitioners namely Manoj Kumar Singh and Vijay Pratap Singh (Petitioners in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 44248 of 2026) is concerned, considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case and taking into account that the petitioners are directors of the company and have made material misrepresentations to defraud the bank, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

9. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners are, hereby, **rejected.**

(Alok Kumar, J)

manish/-

U		T	