

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.60421 of 2018

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-584 Year-2018 Thana- AHİYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Navendu Singh @ Navendu Kumar, S/o Nand Kishor Singh, R/o Vill.-
Rampur, P.O.- Patepur, District- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

1. The State Of Bihar.
2. Chanda Kumari Chanchala, D/O Ram Janam Singh, R/V-Nazirpur, Bank
Colony, P.S. Ahiyapur, District-Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Parties

Appearance :

For the Petitioner	:	Mr.Rajeev Kumar Singh, Advocate.
For the State	:	Mr. Rana Randhir Singh, A.P.P.
For the O.P. No. 2	:	None.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUDHIR SINGH

ORAL ORDER

6 21-01-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel for the State. None had appeared on behalf of the
opposite party no. 2.

The petitioner was granted anticipatory bail vide order
dated 01.10.2018 passed in the present case.

The present application has been placed at the
instance of a letter dated 21.10.2018, addressed to Hon'ble the
Chief Justice, Patna High Court, sent by the informant Chanda
Kumari Chanchala of the present case, stating therein that the
petitioner has got criminal antecedent and the same has not been
stated in paragraph no. 3 of the main anticipatory bail
application.



Learned Mr. Ratnakar Jha and learned Ms. Kusum Rani had filed appearance on behalf of opposite party no.2. When the matter is taken up, they are not present in the Court.

A supplementary affidavit has been filed on behalf of learned counsel for the petitioner. The following statements have been made in paragraph nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the supplementary affidavit.

“2. That the present supplementary affidavit is being filed to bring on record the antecedent of petitioner which inadvertently was not brought on record.

3. That apart from case in hand i.e. Ahiyapur P.S. Case No. 584/18 dated 03.06.2018 the petitioner was an accused in Patepur P.S. No. 56/2009 dated 20.05.2009 in this case the petitioner has already been acquitted.

4. That it is further stated here in Patepur P.S. Case No. 84/1995 dated 20.01.1995 also petitioner was an accused. In this case also petitioner has been acquitted.

5. That in Patepur P.S. Case No. 112/10 dated 21.08.2010 also petitioner was an accused vide order dated 06.09.2018 the petitioner has been acquitted. A copy of order dated 06.09.2018 is annexed as Annexure-3 to this application.”

It has categorically been stated in paragraph nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5 of the supplementary affidavit that the petitioner has already been acquitted in the above mentioned cases prior to institution of the present case. Hence, the petitioner has not suppressed any relevant facts in paragraph no. 3 of the main



anticipatory bail application.

Considering the aforesaid facts, I find no substance/material in the letter in question to proceed further in the present case.

Accordingly, I find no reason to interfere with the order dated 01.10.2018, passed by this Bench in the present case.

(Sudhir Singh, J)

U.K./-

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

