

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49860 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-7 Year-2018 Thana- NTPC District- Patna

Sanjit Kumar @ Jangal Singh S/O Arun Singh R/O Village- Hario, P.S-
Bihpur, Distt.- Bhagalpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Sevak Choudhary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 11-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with N.T.P.C. P.S. Case No. 07 of 2018 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 379 and 411 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Based upon the written report, it is alleged that in the evening of 28.02.2018, the informant's truck bearing registration no. NL01D-6760 was standing at Bhagirath Petrol Pump, Gorakshani and the petitioner, who was cleaner of the said truck was guarding it. In the next morning, on 01.03.2018, the truck was found disappeared and in course of search, the informant came to know that the petitioner stole the truck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner contended that,



in fact, soon after lodging of the FIR, the alleged stolen truck of the informant was recovered from an abandoned place of village Hario; after recovery of the truck, the police filed a requisition before the learned Magistrate requesting therein to add Section 411 I.P.C., which came to be allowed.

5. Learned Advocate for the petitioner further contended that, in fact, there was a dispute with regard to the payment of due salary and since the mother of the petitioner was ill on the alleged date of occurrence, some hot exchange of talk had taken place and the petitioner left the truck and went to his house to see his ailing mother. To support the aforesaid contention, the medical prescription of the petitioner's mother has also been brought on record. It is further contended that the FIR was lodged on 01.03.2018 under Sections 379 and 411 of the I.P.C. and still after lapse of seven years, the investigation is pending and till date no final form/charge-sheet has been submitted and, as such, the instant FIR/criminal proceeding has died its natural death in terms of the mandatory provisions of Section 468 read with 469 CrPC.

6. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State while opposing the bail application submitted that whatever the submissions may be, since the FIR has been instituted long back



in the year 2018 and, as such, the petitioner, *prima facie*, appears to have been evading his arrest for the last seven years.

7. Regard being had to the submissions made on behalf of the parties and taking note of the fact that the petitioner was named in the FIR; though he should immediately approach before the Court concerned for getting privilege of bail but he was found evading and, as such, this Court is not acceded to the prayer for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his prayer is rejected.

8. However, if the petitioner surrenders before the Court below within a period of four weeks from today and seeks regular bail, the same shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the present order on the same date itself, taking into consideration the provisions of Section 468 read with 469 CrPC and the other grounds, which have been taken before this Court.

(Harish Kumar, J)

rohit/-

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

