

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.64083 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-19 Year-1999 Thana- VIGILANCE District- Patna

=====

Sarwar Imam @ S.M. Sarwar Imam @ Sarwar Iam @ Dr. Sarwar Imam S/o
Late S.M. Zareef Resident of Mohalla- Qaziyana, Village- Bahera, Po -
Bahera, PS- Bahera, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar through Vigilance Deptt. Investigation Bureau, Bihar,
Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sanjeev Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Arvind Kumar

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 09-09-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

A.P.P. for the State along with learned counsel appearing on

behalf of the informant.
2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection

with Vigilance P.S. Case No.19/1999 and Special Case
No.21(B)/1999, registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 420, 465, 468, 471, 477(a), 109, 120B of the Indian
Penal Code & Sections 13(2) and 13(1)(d) of Prevention of
Corruption Act, 1988 and Section 4(2) of Bihar Non-
Government Physical Training College and Non-Government
Primary Teachers Education College (Control and Regulation)
Ordinance, 1982.
3. This is the second attempt of anticipatory bail to the



petitioner. The petitioner had earlier moved before this Court seeking anticipatory bail application by filing Cr. Misc. No.41095/2017 and the same was rejected by an order dated 06.09.2017 passed by the then learned coordinate Bench with a direction to the petitioner to surrender before the learned court below and seek regular bail which shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudiced by the said order.

4. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner after 8 years has again approached this Court seeking anticipatory bail on the ground that petitioner is suffering from illness. On query of the court that as to what is the age of the petitioner, the learned counsel submits that petitioner is about 60 years of age.

5. Learned A.P.P. vehemently opposes the prayer for second anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that from perusal of the order dated 06.09.2017 in Cr. Misc. No.41095/2017, it would manifest that the Court after rejecting the anticipatory bail application had directed the petitioner to surrender before the learned trial court but then the petitioner disobeyed the said order by not surrendering nor challenged the order, before the Hon'ble Supreme Court rather sat idle and after 8 years, a lame excuse is being made that the petitioner on



health ground has again moved seeking anticipatory bail.

6. The Court is in complete agreement with the submission of the learned APP, as such is not inclined to entertain the second anticipatory bail application.

7. The second anticipatory bail application of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

