

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38896 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-123 Year-2026 Thana- RANIGANJ District- Araria

Sunil Yadav @ Sumit Kumar S/O Raghu Yadav Resident Of Village-
Koshkapur, Uttar Ward No. 3, Police Station- Raniganj, District- Araria

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Rana

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-06-2026 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 offence punishable under Section 30(a) of
Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act, 2022.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and allegation is of
recovery of 340.320 litres of liquor from a Scorpio vehicle. It is
next submitted that 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 came to be implicated
based on confessional statement of Chandan in police custody
which does not have any evidentiary value.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for



anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

5. 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.5000/- (Rupees five thousand) 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 Raniganj P.S. Case No.123/2026, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

6. It is made clear that the learned trial court thereafter shall verify the criminal antecedents of the petitioner and in the event if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of more than one case, in that event, it would be presumed that petitioner had concealed his antecedent before this court, as such, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed but if on verification it is found that petitioner has antecedent of one case, in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

amit/-

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

