

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.18003 of 2020

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-288 Year-2019 Thana- NADI P.S. District- Patna

-
1. RAJDEO RAI Son of Late Ram Das Rai Resident of Village - Kripal Tola, P.S.- Nadi, District- Patna
 2. Nagendra Kumar @ Nagendra Rai Son of Late Ram Das Rai Resident of Village - Kripal Tola, P.S.- Nadi, District- Patna
 3. Sheetal @ Sheetal Rai @ Satendra Rai Son of Late Ram Das Rai Resident of Village - Kripal Tola, P.S.- Nadi, District- Patna
 4. Nandu Prasad @ Nandu Rai Son of Late Ram Das Rai Resident of Village - Kripal Tola, P.S.- Nadi, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shyamal Prakash, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nand Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

3 25-10-2021 Learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the application of petitioner no. 4, Nandu Prasad @ Nandu Rai, since during the pendency of this application, he has been arrested.

Permission is accorded.

Accordingly, the application of petitioner no. 4 is dismissed as withdrawn.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 and learned counsel for the State.

The petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 apprehend their arrest in

connection with Nadi P.S. Case No. 288 of 2019 registered under Sections 341, 323, 504, 307, 427, 353, 332, 333, 188, 120 (B) and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30 (a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2018 pending in the Court of Special Judge, Excise, Patna.

Submission of learned counsel for the petitioners is that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. There is general and omnibus allegations against them.

Learned A.P.P. appearing on behalf of the State opposed the prayer of the petitioners by contending that on perusal of seizure list, it appears that the alleged liquor has been recovered from the house of the petitioners. Hence, these petitioners do not deserve anticipatory bail.

Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, prayer of the petitioner nos. 1, 2 and 3 is rejected.

(Arvind Srivastava, J)

utkarsh/-

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