

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.53634 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-219 Year-2016 Thana- ALAMGANJ District- Patna

=====

Sant Kumar @ Satya Priya S/O Late Brahmdeo Prasad R/O Mohalla-
Sanicharapar, P.S.- Alamganj, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar Mouar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Uday Chand Prasad, Advocate

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE HARISH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 22-08-2025 Heard Mr. Arvind Kumar Mouar, learned Advocate

for the petitioner and the learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Alamganj P.S. Case No. 219 of 2016, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 419, 420, 467, 468, 471, 34
of the Indian Penal Code.

3. This is the second attempt made on behalf of the
petitioner for grant of his anticipatory bail as the earlier prayer
for anticipatory bail of the petitioner came to be rejected by this
Court in Cr. Misc. No. 14864 of 2025 *vide* order dated
12.05.2025, taking note of the fact that the petitioner had
already moved before the learned Sessions Court for grant of his
anticipatory bail long back in the year 2016 in ABP No. 5877 of
2016, which came to be rejected on 20.12.2016 and after eight
years, the petitioner had filed anticipatory bail.

4. Learned Advocate for the petitioner, taking this



Court to the order dated 10.01.2024, submitted that for the first time the Investigating Officer had filed an application for issuance of non-bailable warrant in the year 2024 and *vide* afore-noted order dated 10.01.2024, non-bailable warrant was issued. Thus, facing apprehension of arrest, the petitioner has approached this Court. Hence, in no circumstances, the petitioner can be said to be the person, who was evading his arrest.

5. On the other hand, learned Advocate for the State opposed the pre-arrest bail application.

6. Having considered the submissions advanced by learned Advocate for the petitioner and taking note of the fact that there is no subsequent development or changed circumstances to renew his prayer for anticipatory bail, coupled with the fact that the subjected FIR was instituted, *inter alia*, for the offences which are cognizable and non-bailable in nature and the police may arrest without any warrant; in as much as the petitioner was well aware of the fact that his prayer for bail stood rejected long back in the year 2016, but he approached this Court after eight years, this Court does not find any further reason or occasion to reconsider the earlier order dated 12.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 14864 of 2025.



7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner stands rejected.

8. The petitioner is directed to surrender and pray for regular bail, preferably within a period of four weeks from today.

(Harish Kumar, J)

saurovkrishna/-

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

