

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A.B.A. No. 3260 of 2026

Violet Mundu, aged about 36 years, D/o Umblan Mundu, resident of Village-
Dudri, P.O. & P.S. Murhu, District- Khunti **... Petitioner**

-Versus-

The State of Jharkhand

... Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioner : Mr. Vishal Kumar Rai, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Vishwanath Roy, Spl.P.P.

05/23.07.2026 Heard learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and learned counsel
appearing for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in connection with Raidih P.S.
Case No.11/2026, registered for the offence under Sections 316(5), 318(4)
and 344 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, pending in the Court of the
learned Judicial Magistrate, 1st Class, Gumla.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has been falsely implicated in the case. He next submits that the
petitioner has joined the service on 13.11.2023 and she was suspended on
23.11.2023. He also submits that the present FIR has been lodged on
13.03.2026. He then submits that the petitioner has been made escape goat
by other staff. He further submits that so far as difference in the amount to
the tune of Rs.98,500/- is concerned, daily cash book was signed and closed
by other staff, namely, Anil Topno at the end of the day and, therefore, liability
cannot be fastened upon the petitioner. On these grounds, he submits that
anticipatory bail may kindly be granted to the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel appearing for the State opposed the prayer and submits that the petitioner happened to be Cashier in Bank of India, Raidih Branch, Gumla. He further submits that the petitioner is responsible for such misappropriation of fund. He next submits that departmental proceeding is also going on against the petitioner. He also submits that one of the victim, who is consumer of the said bank, has also stated that from the bank account of his father, sum of Rs.5,50,000/- has been withdrawn fraudulently by the petitioner and that has come in the statement recorded under Section 180 of the BNSS. On these grounds, he submits that the prayer for anticipatory bail may kindly be rejected.

5. The petitioner is the Head Cashier and she has got role of collecting the cash and maintaining the register. The sum of Rs.98,500/- from the account was found to be misappropriated and that has been found true in preliminary inquiry made by the concerned Bank. The integrity of the person, who is working in the Bank, is required to be kept above board. There is serious allegation against the petitioner being a Cashier of the Bank. In the attending facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and, as such, her prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

6. Accordingly, this application is dismissed.

(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)

*Dated: 23rd July, 2026
Ajay/*