

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.45475 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-122 Year-2016 Thana- C.B.I CASE District- Muzaffarpur

CHANDRA BHUSHAN OJHA Son of Late Jagarnath Sharma @ Jagarnath
Ojha Resident of Village and P.O. Khabra, P.S.- Sadar, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Director General (Vigilance), Patna Bihar
3. Superintendent of Police-cum-S.H.O., Vigilance P.S. Bihar, Patna Bihar
4. Deputy Superintendent of Police (Vigilance Investigation Bureau),
Muzaffarpur Circle Muzaffarpur, Bihar
5. Police Inspector, Vigilance Investigation Bureau, Muzaffarpur Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shiv Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANSUL
ORAL JUDGMENT**

Date : 20-04-2026

Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
the learned counsel for the opposite parties.

2. The present quashing application has been filed on
behalf of the petitioner for quashing the FIR lodged by Vigilance
being Vigilance P.S. Case No. 122 of 2016 under Section 13(2)
read with 13(1)(e) of the Prevention of Corruption Act which is
pending before the Special Judge, Vigilance, Muzaffarpur.

3. Allegation is that petitioner is a Class III employee on
the post of clerk at Primary Health Centre, Kudhni, Muzaffarpur



and he earned disproportionate property during his service period by illegal means.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that petitioner is innocent and the property is not petitioner's property but the same is the property of family members also who are in other business with wife of the petitioner and his sons are also doing their business of their own. Somebody with bad intention has filed a petition to harass the petitioner and his family members. The petitioner claims that his income and disproportionate assets were wrongly calculated.

5. Learned counsel for the opposite parties has vehemently opposed the prayer for quashing the FIR bearing Vigilance P.S. Case No. 122 of 2016.

6. This is not the forum which could enter into the analysis of the income and expenditure of the petitioner. The petitioner may raise it at the appropriate stage. Accordingly prayer for quashing the FIR is rejected.

7. In result, the instant application stands dismissed.

(Ansul, J)

amitkr/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	24.04.2026
Transmission Date	24.04.2026

