

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41686 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-115 Year-2025 Thana- BARHAT District- Jamui

Mahesh Yadav S/o Uttam Yadav Resident of Village- Guguldih, P.O.-
Guguldih, P.S.- Barhat, District- Jamui- 811305 (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rahul Mani

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Syed Mojibur Rahman

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

- 2 30-06-2026 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 has antecedent of one case under the Excise Act and allegation is of recovery of 40 litres of liquor from a motorcycle.
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 he came to be implicated based on confessional statement of Rahul in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value.
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 before the learned trial court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on Provisional anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 5,000/- (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 Barhat P.S. Case No. 115 of 2025, 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 more than 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 has antecedent of one case in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

