

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.10658 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -144 Year- 2017 Thana -BATH District- BHAGALPUR

=====

1. GANESH PRASAD SINGH @ GANESH PRASAD S/o Late
Parameshwari Prasad Singh, R/o Village- Nayagawn, P.S.- Bath, District-
Bhagalpur.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Bihar State food and Civil supply Corporation, through its District
Manager S.F.C. Bhagalpur.

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Shanker Pankaj
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sir Pawan Kumar Chaurasiya

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VINOD KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

3 21-03-2018 This case has been listed today under the heading
“To Be Mentioned” at the instance of learned counsel for the
petitioner.

It has been submitted that the petitioner vide order
dated 27.02.2018 passed in this case has been granted the privilege
of anticipatory bail. In the said order, it appears that inadvertently
in fourth line of para 3 of the said order, it has been mentioned as
that petitioner was granted the privilege of provisional anticipatory
bail by this Court vide order dated 13.12.2016 passed in Cr. Misc.
No. 47296/2016, whereas, it should have been mentioned as co-
accused of this case was granted anticipatory bail vide order dated
13.12.2016. Similarly in para 5 of the said order it has been
mentioned that petitioner is directed to deposit the rest of the
installments within the period as directed in order dated
06.09.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 20567/2017, whereas in the



said order dated 06.09.2017, co-accused Mukti Prasad Singh was directed to deposit the CMR and not the petitioner.

In view of the said submission of learned counsel for the petitioner para -3 of the said order dated 27.02.2018 is modified to the extent that in place of petitioner, it should be read as co-accused was granted the provisional anticipatory bail vide order dated 13.12.2016 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 47296/2016.

So far para – 5 of the said order is concerned, It is modified to the extent that the same be read as follows:-

“Having heard both sides, considering the facts and circumstances of the case, let the petitioner above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bond of Rs. 25,000 (Rs. Twenty Five Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned ACJM-XIII, Bhagalpur, in connection with Bath P.S. Case No. 144 of 2017, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.

Further a period of two weeks is also extended to the petitioner to surrender before the court below for furnishing bail bonds from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

Let a copy of this order be communicated to the concerned court below.

(Vinod Kumar Sinha, J)

sunil/-

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

