

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.56859 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-144 Year-2024 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Sitamarhi

Satjeet Kumar Govind Son of Ashok Prasad R/V- Ward No. 6, Nagar
Panchayat Janakpur Road Pupri, P.S.- Pupri, Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Anil Kumar, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Shaheen Begum, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

2 04-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Pupri-Prohibition & Excise P.S. Case No.144 of 2024
instituted under Section 30(a)/32(C)/37 of the Bihar Prohibition
and Excise (Amendment) Act.

3. As per prosecution case, there is recovery of 2.325
litres foreign liquor from a motorcycle bearing Registration
No.BR-30-AB 7603 and co-accused who was driving the
motorcycle was apprehended, who disclosed the name of
petitioner for whom he was assisting in the business of selling
the illegal liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this
case. He further submits that nothing has been recovered from



the possession of petitioner. Learned counsel submits that petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery of illicit liquor. He further submits that there are six criminal antecedents of petitioner, in which he is on bail.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that earlier in the bail application it was stated that there was no criminal antecedent, however, in the supplementary affidavit it is stated that six criminal cases of similar nature is pending against the petitioner and he is habitual offender involved in the illegal business of liquor.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions of learned counsel for the parties as well as the allegations made against the petitioner and in view of the fact that the petitioner has six criminal antecedents of similar nature, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

