

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58746 of 2024

In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.810 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-572 Year-2021 Thana- MASHRAK District- Saran

=====

Rohit Kumar Singh S/O Madan Singh R/O Village- Mashrakh, P.S-
Mashrakh, Distt.- Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rakesh Mohan Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-08-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner as well as
learned APP for the State.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits
petitioner was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by order
dated 10.04.2024 in Cr. Misc. No.810 of 2024. It is next
submitted that in the order dated 10.04.2024 it was recorded that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent. It is further
submitted that the order also recorded that -It is made clear that
the learned trial court before accepting the bail bonds of the
petitioner shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner
and in the event, if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of
even one case, in that event, the present anticipatory bail order
shall not be given effect.

3. It is next submitted that Cr. Misc. No.810 of 2024



was filed in November, 2023, but then the case was allotted in the year 2024, as such the Cr. Misc. was numbered as Cr. Misc. No.810 of 2024. It is also submitted that the instant case in which petitioner came to be implicated was instituted in December, 2023, as such the could not be mentioned in Cr. Misc. No.810 of 2024., on which the learned APP submits that petitioner is named in the FIR and the FIR was instituted in December, 2023 while anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner on 10.04.2024, as such petitioner had enough time to file a supplementary affidavit for bringing the criminal antecedent on record.

4. Considering the submission made by the learned APP, the Court is not inclined to allow the modification application.

5. The modification application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Prakash Narayan

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

