

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29065 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-163 Year-2020 Thana- SULTANGANJ District- Patna

1. Ishrat W/O Md. Sikandar @ Sikandar Ahmad R/o Mohalla - Dargah Road, P.S.- Sultanganj, Distt.- Patna
2. Ayesha Khatoon W/o Md. Sadique R/o Mohalla - Dargah Road, P.S.- Sultanganj, Distt.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mahtab Alam, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 15-05-2025 Heard the learned Advocate for the petitioners and the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Special Case No. 3864 of 2020, arising out of Sultanganj P.S. Case No. 163 of 2020, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 224, 225, 353 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2018.

3. Learned Advocate for the petitioner fairly contended that earlier the petitioners along with three other persons have moved before this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 3487 of 2021 in connection with the present case, wherein, the Court



having taken note of all the materials available on record has been pleased to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail vide order dated 29.11.2021.

4. Despite the bail granted by this Court, the petitioners, who are labour, could not understand the intricacies of law, did not surrender and later on, when the police started chasing them, they approached before the Court below. However, their application came to be rejected.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposed the pre-arrest bail application and submits that the petitioners have been evading from the law from the last four years, despite the fact they have been granted bail by this Court.

6. Considering the submissions advanced by the learned Advocate for the respective parties and taking note of the fact that the petitioners have already been extended the privilege of anticipatory bail, but they did not furnish bail bonds within the stipulated period and more than 3 ½ years have been elapsed.

7. The petitioners are hereby directed to surrender before the jurisdictional Court, who shall consider their application for regular bail, taking note of the fact that earlier the petitioners have accorded the privilege of anticipatory bail,



but on account of sheer negligence, their bail bond could not be furnished. It is expected, the learned Court shall consider the prayer of the petitioners without being prejudiced by the order of this Court, instantly.

8. The bail application stands disposed off with the aforesaid observation.

(Harish Kumar, J)

shivank/-

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

