

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-270 Year-2025 Thana- PUNAURA District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

... .. Opposite Party/s

For the Petitioner/s

Mr.Santosh Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s :

Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-04-2026 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 a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of the Bihar Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and allegation is of recovery of 81 litres of liquor from E-Rickshaw.

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 he came to be implicated based on the fact that he is owner of the seized vehicle. It is next submitted that no prudent person would use



his own vehicle for committing an occurrence and thus would create evidence against himself and hence would get implicated, it is further submitted that petitioner was completely unaware that Sunil would misuse the vehicle in the manner as alleged, who was also apprehended from the spot along with Rajnath.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on **Provisional anticipatory bail** on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 500/- (Rupees Five Hundred) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned trial court where the case is pending/successor court in connection with Punaaura P.S. Case No. 270 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

7. It is made clear that thereafter the learned Trial Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in the event if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of even one case then it would be presumed that petitioner, for the purposes of seeking anticipatory bail, had concealed his antecedent before this Court, as such, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed, but after verification if it is found that petitioner is a



person with clean antecedent in that event the provisional
anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

