

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49949 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-89 Year-2026 Thana- Hariharnath P.S. District- Saran

=====

Pintu Chaudhary @ Pintu Kumar Chaudhary Son of Late Dharmnath
Choudhary Resident Of Village- Ghorhat Ps -Manjhi District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bishwajeet Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar Roy, A.P.P

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ALOK KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

2 22-07-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Hariharnath P.S. Case No. 89 of 2026 in a case registered for the offence punishable under Sections 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act, 2018.

3. The prosecution case, in brief, is that on 27.05.2026, informant submitted a written report stating that while he and the police team were checking vehicles at Gajgrah Chowk, he received secret information about a liquor-loaded tractor coming through the Referral Hospital. The police reached near the hospital and intercepted the tractor. The driver attempted to flee but was apprehended and identified himself as Shahid Ali. He also disclosed that the liquor belonged to Pintu Chowdhary. On search, 308.04 litres of foreign liquor was recovered.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the



petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the present case. Counsel further submits that the petitioner is the owner of the alleged vehicle but the alleged vehicle is being driven by co-accused. Counsel also submits that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged seized liquor.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Taking into account the huge recovery of liquor and the vehicle belongs to the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is, hereby, rejected.

8. However, if petitioner surrenders before the concerned Trial Court within a period of six weeks from today then in that case, the Trial Court is directed to pass an order on his surrender-cum-bail application, without being prejudice that the anticipatory bail of the petitioner has been rejected by this Court and the Trial Court shall pass order on the merit of this case.

(Alok Kumar, J)

Bipin/-

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

