

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64512 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2016 Thana- PAKRIDAYAL District- East Champaran

Dilip Kumar @ Dilip Kumar Singh Son of Rajendra Prasad Resident of
Village - Khemai Patti, P.S. Minapur, District-Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Ravi Ranjan, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Dr. Ajeet Kumar, APP.
For the Informant	:	Ms. Rubi Kumari, Adv.
		Mr. Vinay Kumar Singh, Adv.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-12-2024 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner, learned
A.P.P. for the State and the learned counsel appearing on behalf
of the informant.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in connection with Pakridayal P.S. Case No.44/2016, registered for the offence punishable under Sections 302, 120(B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant at the outset draw the attention of the court to Annexure-1 of the anticipatory bail application to submit that petitioner had moved this court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Cr. Misc. No. 45906/2017 and the same came to be rejected by an order dated 02.11.2017. It is next submitted that



though anticipatory bail application of the petitioner was rejected but then petitioner did not surrender, while other other accused persons were apprehended and were put behind bar and they even faced trial and were acquitted. It is submitted that since the petitioner had not surrendered, as such, he was threatening the witnesses not to depose in the trial. It is next submitted that if privilege of bail will be granted to the petitioner, in that event, he will again abscond, as from his conduct, it manifests that he does not take orders of the High Court seriously and has been implicated in a case of murder and is in custody since 18.06.2024.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner though rebuts the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant that petitioner was trying to threaten the witnesses but then is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the informant that despite anticipatory bail of the petitioner being rejected in the year 2017, he did not surrender and at his will surrendered in the year 2024 i.e. after nearly after more than six years of the order passed by this court, rejecting his anticipatory bail application.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned



counsel appearing on behalf of the informant, the court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

6. The bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

