IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.77733 of 2026

CNR No. BRHC011036792026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-22 Year-2025 Thana- AMNAUR District- Saran

==========

Ankit Kumar S/o Ram Pravesh Rai R/o Vill.- Jagdishpur, P.s.- Maker, Dist.- Saran

... ... Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjit Kumar Thakur, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Navin Kr. Pandey, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA SHEKHAR JHA

ORAL ORDER

2 30-10-2026 Heard the parties.

2. The present second anticipatory bail of the petitioner was pressed after rejection his first prayer of anticipatory bail through Cr. Misc. No.40808 of 2026 dated 24.06.2026, considering all available merits.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner preferred the present second anticipatory bail mainly on two grounds. Firstly, the earlier advocate who represented this petitioner, failed to disclose that police after investigation submitted closure report against the petitioner, and secondly, one of the similarly situated co-accused person had already been granted anticipatory bail by one of the learned co-ordinate Bench of this Court through Cr. Misc. No.13865 of

WEB COPY

2026 dated 27.04.2026.

4. It is further submitted that in view of both facts, the prayer of anticipatory bail of petitioner can be re-considered.

5. This Court is of considered view that it cannot review its own order, and furthermore, the petitioner had all occasion to place the order of learned co-ordinate Bench granting anticipatory bail to co-accused through Cr. Misc. No.13865 of 2026 dated 27.04.2026, when the matter of this petitioner was taken on board on 24.06.2026, but same was not brought in knowledge of this Court, and furthermore, mere submission of closure report against the petitioner by the investigating agency, and thereafter taking cognizance by learned jurisdictional magistrate and by taking a different note does not make the case of petitioner for anticipatory bail as learned jurisdictional magistrate is duly empowered to do the same, under the law.

6. The earlier order of anticipatory bail of petitioner, rejecting the prayer was passed supplying due reasons and need not requires to re-visit, in view of submission as advanced aforesaid.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the prayer of anticipatory bail of petitioner stands rejected on second consideration also.

(Chandra Shekhar Jha, J.)

Raushan/-

U		T	

WEB COPY