

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26031 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-421 Year-2025 Thana- OBRA District- Aurangabad

=====

Vinod Yadav S/O Ramjit Yadav R/O Village- Mahadewa, P.S- Obra, District-
Aurangabad, Bihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Rupa Kumari

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

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

- 2 24-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 30(a) and 30(c) of the Bihar
Excise Act.
3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of eight cases out of which seven cases
are under the Excise Act and allegation is of recovery of 90
liters of liquor from Sone Diyara area.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not apprehended from the spot as such nothing was recovered from his conscious possession and even alleged recovery is from a place which does not belong to the petitioner and he came to be implicated at the instance of local person and is in custody since 18.02.2026.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, opposes the bail application of the petitioner and submits that petitioner had earlier moved this Court seeking anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 7181 of 2026 and the petitioner was granted the privilege of provisional anticipatory bail by an order dated 19.02.2026, with a direction to the learned Trial Court to verify his criminal antecedent, but then it is submitted that it appears that petitioner in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 7181 of 2026 has disclosed that he had antecedent of five cases when he had antecedent of eight cases, as such had not approached the Court while seeking anticipatory bail with clean hands, it is thus submitted that if privilege of bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.



7. Accordingly, the instant bail application stands rejected.

8. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

