

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.88277 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-173 Year-2025 Thana- GANGABRIDGE District- Vaishali

1. Bahadur Ray @ Sujit Ray S/O Rambabu Ray Resident of village- Diwantok, Ward no. 6, P.S.- Ganga Bridge, Dist.- Vaishali.
2. Abhimanyu Ray @ Abhimanyu Kumar S/O Munilal Ray Resident of village- Diwantok, Ward no. 6, P.S.- Ganga Bridge, Dist.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Abhishek Kumar, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 20-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 30(a) and 30(c) of the Bihar Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioner no. 1 has antecedent of two cases under the excise act and petitioner no. 3 has antecedent of three cases under the excise act and allegation is of recovery of 600 liters of liquor from bank of Ganga river along with 6000 liters of raw fermented *Jawa Mahua* which was destroyed at the spot.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that



petitioners were not apprehended from the spot as such nothing was recovered from their conscious possession and even alleged recovery is from a place which does not belong to the petitioner and is accessible to villagers at large and they came to be implicated at the instance of Chowkidar with whom they are on an inimical term. It is also submitted that if Chowkidar was aware of the involvement of the petitioners in the occurrence then why he did not inform the police prior to institution of the instant FIR which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is also submitted that once an accused is implicated in a case relating to excise, the police starts implicating mechanically either at the instance of *Chowkidar*, local person, confessional statement or secret information without holding a proper investigation.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners above-named, in the event of their 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. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand) each 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 Ganga Bridge P.S. Case No. 173 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 petitioners and in the event if it is found that petitioner no. 1 has antecedent of more than two cases and petitioner no. 2 has antecedent of more than three cases then it would be presumed that petitioners, for the purposes of seeking anticipatory bail, had concealed their antecedent before this Court, as such, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed, but after verification if it is found that petitioner no. 1 has antecedent of two cases only and petitioner no. 2 has antecedent of three cases only, in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

