

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84561 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-282 Year-2004 Thana- MUNGER COMPLAINT CASE
District- Munger

-
1. Moglal Hemram Son of Late Chote Lal Hemram Resident of Village- Khajuria, P.S.- Katoria, District- Banka
 2. Ratni Marandi Wife of Late Chote Lal Hemram Resident of Village- Khajuria, P.S.- Katoria, District- Banka

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Bihar
2. Shanti Devi Wife of Moglal Hemram Resident of Village- Khajuria, P.S.- Katoria, District- Banka. At present residing at Radodih, P.S.- Kharagpur, District- Munger

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Surya Narayan Sah
For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs.Pronoti Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL ORDER

5 24-04-2026 1. The matter was taken up on 21.04.2026 for grant of anticipatory bail in connection with Complaint Case No. 282C of 2004 disclosing offence under Section 323, 498A, 506 of the I.P.C. and Section 3/4 of the D.P. Act. When the matter was taken up and specific question was asked by the Court that why the petitioner has moved for anticipatory bail after 20 years of the date of filing of complaint and order of cognizance, upon which, learned counsel for the petitioner informed this Court that cognizance was taken in the year 2024 after delay of twenty years. Upon his submission and statement made in the bail application this Court passed order for grant of bail taking into



account the fact that there was delay of about twenty years in taking cognizance of the complaint.

2. When the order was dictated and typed and case record was produced before me for signing of the order, this Court re-verified the fact regarding date of cognizance and this Court found that cognizance was taken in 2004 itself and in the meanwhile processes under Section 82 & 83 of Cr.P.C. were also issued. All these facts were misrepresented by learned counsel before this Court and on his statement that cognizance was taken in the year 2024 this Court granted bail.

3. Accordingly, this Court did not sign the order and fresh order is being passed rejecting the bail application on the ground that after twenty years of order taking cognizance and after issuance of processes under Section 82 & 83 Cr.P.C. the petitioner has filed anticipatory bail application which in my opinion the petitioner is not entitled to.

4. In the result, the prayer for bail is rejected.

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

praful/-

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

