

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25281 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-315 Year-2008 Thana- MUZZFARPUR COMPLAINT CASE
District- Muzaffarpur

-
1. RANJIT KUMAR S/o Ravindra Kumar Resident of Village- Kudhni, P.S.- Kudhni, District- Muzaffarpur.
 2. Smt. Nirmla Devi W/o Ranjit Kumar Resident of Village- Kudhni, P.S.- Kudhni, District- Muzaffarpur.
 3. Pankaj Kumar Singh S/o Lakshman Prasad Resident of Village- Kudhni, P.S.- Kudhni, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Ram Sogarath Mahto S/o Late Ramprit Mahto R/o Village- Kudhni, P.S.- Kudhni, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioners	:	Mr.Raju Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mr. Nand Kishore Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL ORDER

2 02-11-2020 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State through video conference. Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes that all defects pointed out by the Stamp Reporter shall be removed, and compliance with the conditions of the notices of this Court with regard to acceptance of e-filing shall be made, without delay immediately upon resumption of normal physical functioning of the Court, and in any event within one month thereof.

2. The petitioners renew their prayer for anticipatory bail in connection with Complaint Case No. 315 of 2008, Tr. No.



2016 of 2020 in view of non-compliance of the earlier order dated 02.05.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 40193 of 2016 requiring steps to be taken for filing requisites for issuance of notice upon opposite party no. 2.

3. At the very outset, learned APP points out that the petitioners have approached this Court with the present petition in a matter arising out of an old Complaint Case No. 315 of 2008. Moreover, steps for restoration of Cr. Misc. No. 40193 of 2016 do not appear to have been taken and instead a fresh anticipatory bail petition has been filed.

4. Having regard to the submissions of learned APP which are not denied by the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to consider the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail. The petition stands dismissed.

5. Office shall follow-up to ensure that all defects are removed and compliance with the notices of this Court are made by the petitioners within the stipulated time provided in para 1 hereinabove, failing which the matter shall be brought to the notice of this Court.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Chandran/-

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

