

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.33875 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -353 Year- 2011 Thana -MUZAFFARPUR TOWN District-
MUZAFFARPUR

=====

1. Ranjeet Kumar Sarraf @ Bablu Son of Prahlad Prasad, R/o Mohalla-
Chhata Bazar, Gopaljee Lane, P.O. -Head, P.S.- Town, District-
Muzaffarpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. Prem Kumar, Son of Kailash Prasad, R/o Mohalla- Gopaljee Lane Chhata
Bazar, P.S.- Town, District- Muzaffarpur.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nikunj Shekhar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sri Anil Prasad Singh

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. ANJANA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

4 04-10-2017 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned counsel appearing on behalf of the opposite
party No. 2 as well as learned counsel for the State.

It is submitted on behalf of the petitioner that
the opposite party who was extended the privilege of
anticipatory bail in Cr. Misc. No. 31322 of 2014 on
28.07.2014 has suppressed his criminal antecedent
while filing the said anticipatory bail application and it
was only on account of such suppression of fact that the
opposite party No. 2 was extended the pre-arrest bail.

However, after hearing learned counsel for the
opposite party and learned counsel appearing on behalf



of the State, it appears that apart from the two cases referred to in the earlier bail application against the opposite party No. 2, two other cases have also been registered against him which is evident from paragraph No. 6 of the present application for cancellation of bail.

Learned counsel for the opposite party No. 2 submits that in the first case bearing Town P.S. Case No. 178 of 2012 dated 14.04.2012 final form had already been submitted in which the opposite party No. 2 has not been placed for trial. However, subsequently, he was summoned by the Court but the said summon was not received by him. So far as the other case being Town P.S. Case No. 509 of 2017 dated 10.07.2014 is concerned, learned counsel for the opposite party No. 2 submits that the same was lodged on the date when the bail application was filed before this Court and, therefore, it could not have amounted to suppression of fact.

Having heard the parties and keeping in mind the fact that the petitioner has not misused the privilege of bail and there is no other allegations which would impel this Court to cancel the earlier pre-arrest bail



order, the present application for cancellation stands dismissed.

(Anjana Mishra, J)

Saif/-

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

