

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2026 Thana- Panapur District- Muzaffarpur

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-45 Year-2026 Thana- Panapur District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shabina Talat

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mritunjay Kumar Nirala

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 17-06-2026 **1.** Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
A.P.P. for the State.

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 12.750 litres of liquor from a hut near aluminum factory.

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 even the alleged recovery is from a place which does not belong to the petitioner and he came to be implicated based on secret information which is the easiest way to implicate someone without holding a proper investigation.



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 Panapur P.S. Case No. 45 of 2026 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	
---	--	---	--

