

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47377 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-422 Year-2022 Thana- SUPAUL District- Supaul

1. Sonu Jaiswal @ Sonu Kumar Son of Bhola Choudhary Ward No. 11 Mahabir Chowck, P.S.-Supaul, District-Supaul
2. Binod Kumar Son Of Hari Krishna Bhagat, Resident Of Station Road, Ward No. 25, P.S.-Supaul, District-Supaul
3. Suraj Narayan Gupta @ Surya Narayan Gupta Son of Mahadev Prasad Gupta Resident of Mahabir Chowck, Ward No. 12, Supaul, P.S.-Supaul, District-Supaul
4. Dheeraj Kumar Son Of Radha Krishna Choudhary, Resident Of Mallik Chowck, Ward No. 12, Supaul, P.S.-Supaul, District-Supaul

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Nagendra Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Md. Ataur Rahman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJEEV RANJAN PRASAD
ORAL ORDER

2 11-08-2023 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP
for the State.

2. The petitioners in the present case are seeking pre-arrest bail in connection with Supaul P.S. Case No. 422 of 2022 registered for the offences punishable under Section 63 of the Copyright Act, 1957. They have got no criminal antecedent.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the allegations against the petitioners are that huge quantity of duplicate goods/items were found in the shops of the petitioners and they are cheating the public at large by selling those duplicate products in the name of Hindustan Unilever Private Limited.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case.



It is submitted that the agents supply the duplicate products of Hindustan Unilever Private Limited to the shops of the petitioners.

5. Learned APP for the State has opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

6. Having regard to the huge quantity of duplicate goods/items which were found in the shops of the petitioners and allegation being that the petitioners were engaged in selling of those duplicate products and the allegation being that those duplicate products were being sold to the public in the name of Hindustan Unilever Private Limited, this case being a case of alleged cheating of the public at large, this Court is not inclined to grant privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is, thus, refused.

8. In case the petitioners surrender and pray for regular bail in the learned court below within a period of four weeks from today, their prayer for regular bail shall be considered on its own merit without being prejudice by the order of this Court.

9. This application stands disposed of.

(Rajeev Ranjan Prasad, J)

SUSHMA2/-

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

