

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57719 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-231 Year-2024 Thana- SONBERSHA RAJ District- Saharsa

Ranveer Kumar S/o Arjun Yadav R/o Village- Basbitti, Ward No. 11, P.S.-
Sonbarsa Raj, Dist.- Saharsa Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Binod Kumar Sinha, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

3 16-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Sonbarsa Raj P.S. Case No. 231 of 2024 instituted under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on secret information that the petitioner who is involved in selling illicit liquor has kept liquor near his house, the police team conducted a raid to verify the same and recovered 13 litres of country made liquor kept in the gallon and white coloured sack from the place of occurrence.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession. The petitioner has no concern with the



seized liquor. Learned counsel submits that petitioner has three criminal antecedents of similar nature out of which he is on bail in two cases and he undertakes to cooperate in the investigation and trial.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail and submits that on specific information against the petitioner, the recovery has been made from the place of occurrence and he has three criminal antecedents of similar nature. Therefore, he does not deserve the privilege of anticipatory bail. He further submits that in view of Full Bench decision of this Court rendered in the case of Ram Vinay Yadav vs. The State of Bihar reported in 2019(2) P.L.J.R. 1089 (F.B.) prima facie case is made out against the petitioner, therefore, the anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions of learned counsel for the parties and the criminal antecedents of petitioner as well as the nature of allegation against 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)

AjayMishra/-

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

