

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**Criminal Miscellaneous No.53930 of 2016**

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -96 Year- 2015 Thana -KARJA District- MUZAFFARPUR

=====

1. Surendra Paswan  
2. Balendra Paswan, Both sons of Rajendra Paswan, Both Resident of  
Village- Barka Gaon, P.S. Karja, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... .... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar

.... .... Opposite Party/s

=====

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nachiketa Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

3      22-12-2016              The matter has been listed under the heading “To be  
Mentioned”.

It has been pointed out by learned counsel for the petitioners that vide order, dated 15.12.2016, passed in this case, two persons have been granted bail, but inadvertently, in the order only the name of petitioner no. 1, namely, Surendra Paswan has been mentioned but the name of petitioner no. 2, namely Balendra Paswan has not been mentioned as there were two petitioners and in the said order instead of petitioner, the word petitioners should have been mentioned.

The Court finds the submission of learned Counsel for the petitioner to be true. The bail application has been filed by the two petitioners namely Surendra Paswan and Balendra Paswan, but inadvertently, only the name of petitioner no. 1 Surendra Paswan has been mentioned and the name of petitioner no. 2 has been left out. It also appears from the order that only the word



‘petitioner’ has been mentioned though it should have been ‘petitioners’.

In such view of the matter, it would be deemed that petitioner no. 2 Balendra Paswan has also been granted bail vide order dated 15.12.2016, and accordingly in the said order the word ‘petitioner’ wherever typed, may be read as ‘petitioners’.

**(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)**

sunil/-

|   |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|
| U |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|

