

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57677 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-104 Year-2025 Thana- MANSI District- Khagaria

1. Ranjeet Paniyar @ Ranjeet Kumar @ Ranjeet Pariyar S/o Guno Paniyar R/o Village- Bangaliya, PS- Mansi, District- Khagaria.
2. Guno Paniyar @ Guno Panjiyar S/o Late Anandi Panjiyar R/o Village- Bangaliya, PS- Mansi, District- Khagaria.
3. Awren Paniyar @ Amrendra Kumar S/o Guno Paniyar @ Guneshwar Panjiyar R/o Village- Bangaliya, PS- Mansi, District- Khagaria.
4. Musan Paniyar @ Amarjeet Kumar S/o Guno Paniyar @ Guno Panjiyar R/o Village- Bangaliya, PS- Mansi, District- Khagaria.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Singh, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy, APP.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNIL DUTTA MISHRA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-09-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

2. Petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Mansi P.S. Case No.104 of 2025 instituted under Section
30(F) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, on secret information
that near the house of petitioner no.1 illegal Cough syrup is
being unloaded from a pickup vehicle, the police team
conducted a raid to the place of occurrence and recovered total
88 litre Wiscodine Cough Syrup from the pickup van and nearby



field. Co-accused Bablu Singh was apprehended on the spot and the petitioners fled away who were identified by the local villagers.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. He further submits that the petitioners are neither owner nor driver of the alleged seized vehicle and they have no concern with the field from where the recovery has been made. Learned counsel submits that petitioners have no concern with the seized material. He further submits that there is no compliance of mandatory provisions of law in search and seizure. Learned counsel submits that no incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of petitioners. Learned counsel submits that petitioners have no criminal antecedent and they undertake to cooperate in the investigation and trial.

5. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioners and submits that there is recovery of huge quantity i.e. 88 litre Codeine Cough Syrup from the possession of petitioners which is commercial quantity. Therefore, they 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 petitioners, therefore, the anticipatory bail is not maintainable.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions of learned counsel for the parties and the recovery of huge quantity of Codeine Cough Syrup, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is, hereby, rejected.

(Sunil Dutta Mishra, J)

Ritik/-

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

