

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59428 of 2025

In
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88044 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-909 Year-2024 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Lakhisarai

Sanjit Ram S/O Late Ramdev Ram R/O Village- Sansr Pokhar, Ward no, 17,
P.S.- Kabaiya, Dist.- Lakhisarai.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rabi Bhushan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 22-08-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by an order dated 08.01.2025 with a direction to surrender within a period of six weeks. Further, the learned trial court was directed to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner before accepting the bail bonds and in the event if it was found that petitioner has antecedent of more than five cases in that event the anticipatory bail order shall not be given effect to.

3. It is submitted that petitioner in compliance of the order dated 08.01.2025 surrendered before the learned trial court on 13.01.2025 but by the time the antecedent report was reported to the learned trial court by that time six weeks period had elapsed, as such, the instant modification application has been filed seeking



modification of the order dated 08.01.2025 in Cr. Misc. No. 88044 of 2024 for extending the period of surrender.

4. Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the modification application and submits that though petitioner has annexed an application showing that he had filed a surrender application on 13.01.2025 but then the same is not a certified copy which amply demonstrates that petitioner never surrendered before the learned trial court. It is further submitted that had the petitioner surrendered on 13.01.2025 and if the antecedent of the petitioner would have been reported subsequently i.e. after efflux of six weeks time in that event the petitioner would have moved before this Court seeking modification of the order instantly but then the instant modification application has been filed on 19.08.2025 i.e. after lapse of more than six months when the period of surrender came to an end which amply demonstrates that petitioner is moving at his leisure.

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

6. Hence, the modification application is dismissed.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

