

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55064 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-348 Year-2024 Thana- BHORE District- Gopalganj

=====

Basant Singh @ Basant Kumar Singh Son of Rajesh Singh, Resident of
village -Rampur PS -Phulwariya District -Gopalganj.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Bhore P.S. Case No.348 of 2024 instituted under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on secret information
that petitioner alongwith one other co-accused are carrying big
consignment of liquor by four wheeler vehicles, the police
intercepted the Scorpio vehicle and recovered 630 litres of
country made liquor from the said Scorpio vehicle bearing
Registration No. BR-01-PJ-5639 and 727.20 liter country made
foreign liquor from another Scorpio vehicle bearing Registration
No. BR-01-PJ-5639.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this



case. He further submits that petitioner has no concern with the alleged seized liquor. Learned counsel submits that there is no compliance of mandatory provision of law in preparing the seizure list. He further submits that no incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. Learned counsel submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in 14 criminal cases of similar nature.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that petitioner is a habitual offender and he has got 14 criminal antecedents of similar nature and witnesses have supported the prosecution case and co-accused Rajan Singh also confessed the involvement of petitioner in the occurrence. Therefore, petitioner does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties as well as the criminal antecedents of similar nature of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, his prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

