

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.3258 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-337 Year-2020 Thana- PAHARPUR District- East Champaran

1. Tuntun Sah S/o- Hari Sah Resident of Village- Amwa nijamat Ps- Paharpur District-East Champaran Bihar
2. Mantu Kumar @ Anjay Kumar S/o- Baltu Sah Resident of Village- Amwa nijamat Ps- Paharpur District-East Champaran Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwari

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 28-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.
2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection with Paharpur PS Case No. 337 of 2020 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 341, 323, 385, 387, 436, 379, 504 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners has antecedent of three cases.
4. At this stage, the learned APP submits that the case is of the year 2020 and the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner was rejected by learned District Judge in the year 2020 itself, five years thereafter again ABP no. 1449 of 2025



was filed (i.e. the instant ABP) and the same came to be rejected on 22-4-2025 and thereafter the instant anticipatory bail application has been filed in January 2026. Learned APP thus submits that petitioner was sleeping over his right and only when some other accused in the FIR was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail, the petitioner woke from his slumber, but then the accused who was granted the privilege of anticipatory bail by this Court in Cr. Misc No. 62409 of 2022, was granted the said privilege by an order dated 3-7-2023, but still the petitioner was sleeping over his right. It is submitted that a person who does not approach the Court in time should not be dealt leniently.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioners is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned APP.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

