

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.13364 of 2015

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -187 Year- 2013 Thana -MUZFFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE District-
MUZAFFARPUR

=====

Shivnath Chaudhary, son of late Ramdeo Choudhary, Director, Shirdi Food Private Ltd. Factory Plot No. 1-7 (P), Industrial Area Bela, Post - M.I.D.C., P.S. Bela District Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Mahendra Pal Singh, son of Sri Babbar Singh, Director, 674/1,2nd floor Mahalaxmi Plaza Building, Shakti Khand III, Indrapuram, Gaziabad, Uttar Pradesh.
3. Mamta Rawat, wife of Mahendrapal Singh, resident of village, Sanjay Nagar, Sector 23 M Block Gaziabad, P.S. Kant Nagar, District Gaziabad (U.P.).

.... Opposite Parties

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Vidyarthi, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. C.Jawahar(App)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE AMARESH KUMAR LAL
ORAL ORDER

4 06-05-2015 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the

learned counsel for the State.

This application has been filed for cancellation of bail of
opposite party nos. 2 and 3, who have been granted anticipatory bail
vide order dated 30.01.2015 passed in Cr. Misc. No.26476/2014.

It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner
that the opposite party nos. 2 and 3 got the order of anticipatory bail
by suppressing the facts.

It appears from the records of Cr. Misc. No.26476/2014
that notice was issued to the petitioner/opposite party no.2 vide order
dated 26.09.2014. It further appears that notice was served on the

petitioner/opposite party no.2 on 21.11.2014, but the petitioner did not choose to appear and, thereafter, opposite party nos. 2 and 3 were granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 30.01.2015. It further appears that the anticipatory bail was granted to the opposite party nos. 2 and 3 with certain conditions mentioned in the aforesaid order dated 30.01.2015.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, I do not find any ground to cancel the bail of opposite party nos. 2 and 3. However, the petitioner is at liberty to raise his grievance before the trial court, if the opposite party nos. 2 and 3 violate any conditions of the bail order dated 30.01.2015.

With this observation, this application stands disposed of.

(Amaresh Kumar Lal, J)

V.K. Pandey/-

U		T	
---	--	---	--