

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30291 of 2025

In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52998 of 2021

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-184 Year-2020 Thana- BEUR District- Patna

=====

Ajit Patel S/O Chandeshwar Patel @ Chandeshwar Mahtoo Resident of
Village- Khorampur, Mahnar, P.S.- Mahnar, District- Vaishali, at present Rajiv
Nagar Road No. -24, P.S.- Rajiv Nagar, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Swati Parmar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kumar Pandey

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-05-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner was granted regular bail by an order dated 14.02.2022
in Cr. Misc. No.52998 of 2021 with a condition that one of the
bailor of the petitioner shall be his father Chandeshwar Patel.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the instant modification application has been filed seeking
modification of the order dated 14.02.2022 in Cr. Misc.
No.52998 of 2021 on the ground that the condition of grant of
bail that one of the bailor of the petitioner shall be his father be
modified as father of the petitioner died.



4. The learned A.P.P. Sri Rabindra Kumar submits that from perusal of the pleadings made at Para-8 of the modification application, it would manifest that it has been pleaded that father of the petitioner died on 12.10.2024 as would manifest from Annexure- P/2 to the modification application. The learned A.P.P. next submits that it absolutely does not stand to reason that if the petitioner was granted the privilege of regular bail by an order dated 14.02.2022 in Cr. Misc. No.52998 of 2021 with a condition that one of the bailor shall be his father, then why the petitioner did not seek bail when his father was alive. It is next submitted that father of the petitioner died on 12.10.2024 i.e. after more than two years eight months of the order by which petitioner was granted the privilege of bail, as such, it is submitted that the ground on which the order is being sought to be modified does not exist.

5. Considering the submissions made by the learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to allow the modification application.

6. The modification application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

