

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52108 of 2025

In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.66285 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-29 Year-2024 Thana- MAHILA P.S. District- Araria

Mohd. Anjar @ Mohd. Anzar @ Mohd. Anjar Alam S/o Sadre Alam Resident
of Village- Hingua Hat, PS- Bhargama, Distt.- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gopal Kumar Jha

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and

learned APP for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by an order dated 23.10.2024 in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 66285 of 2024 with a condition that in the event if charge sheet is submitted connecting the petitioner with the offence, in that event the anticipatory bail order dated 23.10.2024 in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 66285 of 2024 shall lose its effect. It is submitted that the police after investigation submitted charge sheet against the petitioner. It is submitted that charge sheet was submitted on 30.11.2024. It is next submitted that when anticipatory bail was granted to the petitioner, the substantial



investigation was carried out, but the Court was pleased to grant the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner with the aforesaid condition. It is also submitted that after 23.10.2024, no material transpired during the course of investigation connecting the petitioner with the offence apart from the what was there in the case diary upto 23.10.2024.

3. The learned APP for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar, opposes the modification application and submits that if what has been submitted by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is true in that event he ought to have filed an appropriate application instead of seeking modification, on which the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner seeks permission to withdraw the modification application with liberty to file an appropriate application.

4. Permission is accorded.

5. Accordingly, the **modification application is dismissed as withdrawn with the aforesaid liberty.**

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

