

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32125 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-398 Year-2026 Thana- AHİYAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

Deepak Kumar @ Deepak Yadav Son of Gyani Rai Resident of Village -
Ahiyapur, P.S.- Ahiyapur, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bhavesh Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Meena Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-07-2026 Heard Mr. Bhavesh Kumar learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mrs. Meena Singh, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest connection
with Ahiyapur P.S. Case No. 398 of 2026, F.I.R. dated
24.02.2026 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 30(a), 41 of the Bihar Prohibition & Excise Act, 2022
(Amended).

3. Recovery is of 857.52 liters of illicit liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the
present case. It appears from the F.I.R. that altogether 857.52
litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the vehicles in
question and the name of the petitioner has been transpired on



the basis of disclosure made by apprehended co-accused person, namely, Raja Kumar and except the aforesaid, no other cogent material has come during investigation to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence. He further submits that similarly situated co-accused person, namely, Niraj Kumar has been granted bail by this Court today i.e. on 01.07.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 29826 of 2026, another co-accused person, namely, Niraj Kumar @ Niraj Kumar Ray has been granted bail by this Court today i.e. on 01.07.2026 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 30323 of 2026. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioner. There is non-compliance with mandatory procedure prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of Cr. P.C./ Section 103 of BNSS, 2023 No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner referring the provision contained in Section 76(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act and submitted that the pre-arrest bail would not be maintainable. He further submits that the petitioner carries five more cases other than the present one but fairly submits on the basis of paragraph-3 of the bail petition



that the petitioner is on bail in the pending matters.

6. This court is aware of the decision of the Full Bench in the case of Ram Vinay Yadav vs. State of Bihar reported in 2019(2) P.L.J.R. 1089. Having regard to the law laid down in the aforesaid judgment and the submission advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court, for the limited purpose of grant of anticipatory bail, is inclined to accept the submission of counsel for the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and the fact that the petitioner having clean antecedent and nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner or the house of the petitioner and the petitioner has been made accused on the basis of disclosure made by apprehended co-accused person as well as similarly situated co-accused persons have been granted bail by this Court today, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order. be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Exclusive Special Judge, Excise Court No. I, Muzaffarpur in connection with Ahiyapur PS. Case No. 398 of 2026, subject to the conditions as laid



down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 and with other following conditions:-

1. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

2. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

3. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

Ibrar//-

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

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

