

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8770 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-352 Year-2025 Thana- BEUR District- Patna

Rohit Kumar S/o- Baleswar Thakur Resident of Mohalla - Indrapuri Sipara,
P.O. -Dhelwan, P.S.- Beur, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Prasoon Shekhar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection
with Beur P.S. Case No. 352 of 2025, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 30(a), 30(g), 32, 56(b) and 62 of the
Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and allegation is of
recovery of 280 litres of codeine cough syrup from an Auto and
750 litres of codeine cough syrup from godown of Santu.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner was not arrested from the spot as such nothing was
recovered from his conscious possession and is not the owner of
the seized Auto and the godown does not belong to him and he



has no relation or concern with Santu and he came to be implicated based on confessional statement of Dheeraj and Ravi in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that allegation is of recovery of codeine cough syrup. It is next submitted that children of young ages of late have started consuming codeine in large number, which is having severe impact on the society. It is further submitted that no doubt the name of the petitioner transpired in the confessional statement of apprehended-accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value, but since name of the petitioner has transpired as such interrogation of the petitioner is required. It is also submitted that investigation in the case is continuing.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

