

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.50524 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1359 Year-2024 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Jamui

Vijay Kumar Son Of Nandlal Mandal Resident Of Village- Lakhanpur, PS-
Jamui, Dist- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Indu Kumari Srivastava

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 24-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of his
arrest in Jamui P. S. Case No.1359 of 2024 registered for
the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of the Excise
Act.

3. The learned A.P.P., at the outset, submits that
from perusal of Annexure-1, it would manifest that
petitioner had earlier moved this Court seeking anticipatory
bail by filing Cr. Misc. No.22054 of 2026, the Court after
hearing the learned counsel for the parties was pleased to
grant privilege of provisional anticipatory bail application
by an order dated 07.04.2026 with a direction to the learned



Trial Court to verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner thereafter and if it was found that petitioner had antecedent of even one case, in that event, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be given effect to, but if petitioner is a person with clean antecedent, in that event, the provisional anticipatory bail was to be confirmed forthwith.

4. It is next submitted that it appears that petitioner did not surrender within the time stipulated in the order dated 07.04.2026 in Cr Misc. No.22054 of 2026, nor filed a modification application seeking extension of time being aware of the consistent view of the Court that if the accused has not surrendered within the time stipulated in the order by which the anticipatory bail was granted, the modification application are being dismissed, but then very wisely the petitioner filed the instant second anticipatory bail application.

5. The learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submission of the learned A.P.P.

6. Considering the submissions made by the



learned A.P.P., the Court is not inclined to entertain the second anticipatory bail application.

7. The prayer of the petitioner for second anticipatory bail stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

