

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.90239 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-653 Year-2025 Thana- RAMKRISHNANAGAR District- Patna

1. Ravi Kumar Yadav Anil Kumar @ Anil Yadav Resident Of Village- Rahimpur, P.S- Parsa, District- Patna
2. Vinay Kumar S/O Vijay Thakur @ Vijay Sharma Resident Of Village- Rahimpur, P.S- Parsa, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sheo Kumar Prasad

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandar Bhushan Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 27-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State, Sri Chandra Bhushan Prasad.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 37 of the Excise Act and Sections 25(1-B)a, 26, 27 and 35 of the Arms Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and allegation is of recovery of four empty bottles of liquor along with four cartridges and a motorcycle as detailed in the FIR, it is next alleged that police on receiving information that occurrence of firing had taken place, had reached the place of occurrence,



when Munna was apprehended.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have been falsely implicated in the instant case at the instance of confessional statement of Munna. It is further submitted that there is no allegation of any recovery from the possession of the petitioners rather the name of the petitioners transpired based on the confessional statement of apprehended-accused in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value. It is also submitted that petitioners are not the owner of the seized motorcycle; and the cartridges along with empty bottles of liquor are alleged to have been recovered from a semi-constructed house at Madhuban colony and petitioners have no concern or relation with the place of occurrence.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners and submits that no doubt name of the petitioners transpired in the confessional statement of Munna in police custody which does not have any evidentiary value but then the informant alleges that he received an information that accused are resorting to firing based on which he reached the place of occurrence from where the aforesaid articles were seized and Munna was apprehended and it was concessional statement of Munna that name of the petitioner



transpired, it is also submitted that investigation in the case is still continuing.

6. Considering the submission made by learned APP, the Court is not inclined to extend the privilege of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners is rejected.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

