

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.85796 of 2025

In
CRIMINAL APPEAL (SJ) No.718 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2023 Thana- SC/ST District- Madhepura

=====

Soni Devi W/O Bablu Yadav R/o village - Kolahapatti, Ward no. 05, P.S -
Murliganj, Distirct - Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rupesh Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Bharat Bhushan, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 22-12-2025 Heard Mr. Rupesh Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner as well as Mr. Bharat Bhushan, learned APP for the

State.

2. The present modification application has been

filed for modify the order dated 29.07.2025 passed in Cr. Appeal

(SJ) No. 718 of 2024.

3. By the order dated 29.07.2025, the petitioner was

granted bail with the following conditions :-

(1) Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall

be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the

Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the

Court and on her absence on two consecutive dates without

sufficient reason, her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court



below.

(2) If the petitioner tamper with the evidence or the witness, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(3) And, further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage, it is found that the petitioner has concealed her criminal antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that due to communication gap on the basis of the information furnished by the Pairvikar, it was stated in paragraph-3 of the bail petition that the petitioner has no criminal history but in fact the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one.

The Court also noticed Section 362 of Cr. P.C./Section 403 of BNSS, which reads as follows :-

*“362/403- Court not to alter
judgment. Save as otherwise provided
by this Code/Sanhita or by any other*



law for the time being in force, no Court, when it has signed its judgment or final order disposing of a case, shall alter or review the same except to correct a clerical or arithmetical error.”

5. In the aforesaid facts and circumstances, the instant modification petition is dismissed.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

Ibrar//-

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

