

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58359 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-729 Year-2015 Thana- SASARAM MUFFSIL District- Rohtas

1. Sanjay Kumar, male, S/o- Bijay Bahadur Ram;
2. Bijay Bahadur Ram, male, S/o- Majar Ram;
3. Anil Kumar, male, S/o- Majar Ram;
4. Sunil Kumar, male, S/o- Majar Ram;

All are R/o Village- Bararhi, P.S. -Sasaram (M) Distt.- Rohtas.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deovind Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Shakir Ahmad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SOURENDRA PANDEY

ORAL ORDER

2 29-08-2025 This is the second attempt on behalf of the

petitioners for grant of anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners

and the learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest

in connection with Sasaram (M) P.S. Case No. 729 of



2015 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 325, 307, 504, 506, 509 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the previous anticipatory bail application of the petitioners was rejected *vide* order dated 17.10.2024, passed by a Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 69477 of 2024, taking into account the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, who had pointed out that the case was of the year 2015, whereas the application for grant of anticipatory bail was filed in year 2024.

5. It has been submitted on behalf of the petitioners that it was a case where there was an altercation between the two families and case and counter case was registered for the same incident. It has further been submitted that only one person had received grievous injury that too on her hand and the rest of the injuries were found to be simple in nature.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners has



submitted that the petitioners were enjoying the benefit of Section 41(A) of the Cr.P.C. However, the *charge-sheet* in the case was submitted in the year 2023 and only, thereafter, the petitioners approached this Court in year 2024.

7. From the perusal of the previous order dated 17.10.2024, referred to above, it does not seem that the delay in filing the bail application was the only reason on which the said application was rejected by the previous Bench.

8. The learned APP for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners and has submitted that since in this second attempt there is no changed circumstances, the present application is not maintainable.

9. In view of the aforesaid submissions, this Court is not inclined to entertain the present anticipatory bail application.

10. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the



petitioners is, accordingly, rejected with a liberty to them to surrender before the concerned Court below and seek regular bail, which shall be considered on its own merits, without being prejudiced by the present order.

11. The application stands dismissed.

(Sourendra Pandey, J)

Praveen-II/-

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

