

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.37273 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-161 Year-2024 Thana- BARAULI District- Gopalganj

=====

Ramjan Ali @ Sahil Son of Bacha Miyan Resident of Village- Salepur P.S
-Bishambharpur, Dist- Gopalganj

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vyas Kumar Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Bhushan Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 229-06-2026
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 Barauli P.S. Case No. 161 of 2024, registered for the offences punishable under Section 414 of the IPC and Section 30(a) of the Bihar Excise Act.
3.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has antecedent of three cases under the Excise Act and allegation is of recovery of 60.12 litres of liquor from a Scorpio vehicle and a pistol was seized from possession of Bullet Kumar @ Vikash Kumar.
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 vehicle and his name transpired in the confessional statement of Bullet Kumar along with other accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State vehemently opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner and submits that it is not a case only under the Excise Act rather allegation is of recovery of Arms from possession of Bullet and based on confessional statement of Bullet, the name of the petitioner transpired and since petitioner has antecedents and the case is in its nascent stages of investigation hence if privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner may abscond.

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	
---	--	---	--

