

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.13762 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-187 Year-2014 Thana- BIHTA District- Patna

Vikash Kumar @ Bikash Kumar @ Vikash Ray Son of Ramesh Ray Resident
of Village- Daulatpur, P.O. and P.S.- Bihta, Distt.- Patna, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Kant Kumar, Adv.
For the State : Mr. Akshay Lal Pandit, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE JUSTICE SMT. SONI SHRIVASTAVA
ORAL ORDER

5 10-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bihta P.S. Case No. 187 of 2014 registered for the
offences punishable under Section 272, 273, 290, 420 of the
Indian Penal Code and Section 47(A) of the Bihar Prohibition
and Excise Act.

3. The recovery of total 60 litres of country made liquor
has been shown from the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
recovery has been made from the joint house of the petitioner
and he was not present at the relevant time. It is also submitted
that a fake recovery has been shown as the mandatory



provisions of search and seizure have been violated since there are no independent witnesses on the seizure list. The petitioner has further given an explanation in paragraph 14 of this petition that he recently came to know about this case and that he is wanted by the police and hence, he has filed this petition after a delay. It is next submitted that petitioner has no criminal antecedent as mentioned in para 3 of the bail application.

5. Learned APP for the State, however, opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail mainly on the ground that this is a case of the year 2014 and the petitioner has approached the Courts for grant of anticipatory bail only in the year 2025. It is also submitted that it cannot be comprehended that a recovery which was made from his own house was not known to the petitioner.

6. Considering the rival contentions, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail mainly on the ground that he has approached the Courts after a substantial delay. The prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is hereby rejected.

7. Accordingly, the application stands dismissed.

8. However, the case diary and the report that was called for from this Court reveals that till date the investigation



against the petitioner is going on and no coercive processes
have been issued against him as yet.

(Soni Shrivastava, J)

divyanshi/-

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

