IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75359 of 2026
CNR No. BRHC011086522026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-167 Year-2024 Thana- Excise Thana Hajipur District- Vaishali

==========

Ajeet Kumar S/o Suresh Singh Resident of Village- Shankarpur, Ward No.3, P.S.- Akodhi Gola, District- Rohtas

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ashok Kumar Singh, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Humayou Ahmad Khan, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 30-10-2026 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 Sections 30(a), 32(1), (3) and 41(1), (2) of the Bihar Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has antecedent of seven cases out of which three cases are under the Excise Act and allegation is of recovery of 319.680 liters of liquor from a truck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not apprehended from the spot as such nothing was recovered from his conscious possession and he came to be implicated based on the fact that he is owner of the seized truck, but then petitioner had sold the truck to one Akash, on which the learned APP submits that if what has been submitted by the

WEB COPY

learned counsel for the petitioner is accepted, in that event Akash would become an accused. It is also submitted by the learned APP that there is no documentary evidence on record to even remotely suggest that the ownership of the vehicle was legally transferred in the name of Akash. It is next submitted that petitioner has antecedent of seven cases and it might be a ploy of the petitioner to seek anticipatory bail. It is further submitted that the Court is lenient in granting anticipatory and regular bail in cases relating to Excise, but then where petitioner takes such plea without any documentary evidence, the Court should be reluctant in interfering.

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 APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the instant anticipatory bail application stands rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY