

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14330 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-328 Year-2025 Thana- EXCISE MADHUBAN District- East
Champaran

-
1. ARVIND SAH @ ARVIND KUMAR GUPTA S/o- Dashrath Sah @ Dasrath Sah R/v- Ahirauliya Bada Chakiya, Ps- Chakiya Dist- East Champaran
 2. Dharmendra Sah @ Dharmendra Kumar S/o- Dashrath Sah @ Dasrath Sah R/v- Ahirauliya Bada Chakiya, Ps- Chakiya Dist- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Suraj Kumar Tiwari

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Arun Kumar Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-03-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in connection
with Madhuban PS Case No. 328 of 2025, registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 30(a) and 45 of the Bihar
Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the
petitioners are person with clean antecedent and allegation is of
recovery of 22.080 litres of liquor from godown of the
petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the
petitioners were not arrested from the spot as such nothing was
recovered from their conscious possession.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for



anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that there is a specific allegation in the FIR that 22.080 litres of liquor was recovered from godown of the petitioners and in the anticipatory bail application, there is no averment with regard to the ownership, which amply demonstrates that the godown belongs to the petitioners. It is next submitted that apart from the said fact what is alleged in the FIR is that petitioner no. 1 was arrested and petitioner no. 2 along with 50 unknown criminals assaulted the police force and damaged the vehicle and even freed petitioner no. 1. It is thus submitted that if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted, in the nature of the allegation as alleged, the petitioners would feel embolden for committing similar offences in future.

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	
---	--	---	--

