IN THE HIGH COURT OF JHARKHAND AT RANCHI
A. B. A. No. 2195 of 2026

1. Krishna Prasad @ Krishna Saw @ Krishna Sao, aged about 34 years, son of Kishore Saw, resident of Urgi, P.O. and P.S. Bishnugarh, District-Hazaribagh
2. Ashok Sao, aged about 35 years, son of Raghu Saw, resident of village-Baray, P.O. and P.S. Bishnugarh, District-Hazaribagh

..... … Petitioners

Versus

The State of Jharkhand ..... … Opposite Party

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJAY KUMAR DWIVEDI

For the Petitioners :Mr. A.K. Sahani, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Subodh Kr. Dubey, A.P.P

02/ 01.05.2026: Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned counsel for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Bishnugarh P.S. Case No. 0018 of 2026, registered under sections 338, 336(3), 340(2), 318(4), 274, 275, 125 and 61(2) of the BNS, 2023 as well as under section 47a, 47(e), 52 and 55 of the Excise Act, pending in the Court of learned Judicial Magistrate, Ist Class, Hazaribagh.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that allegations are made that illicit liquor has been recovered from the pick-up van and the name of the petitioners has been taken by some of the apprehended co-accused persons who have been granted regular bail. He next submits that recovery of 526 bottles of liquor is there from the house of petitioner no.1 and so far petitioner no. 2 is concerned, there is no recovery from him. On these grounds, he submits that the petitioners may kindly be provided privilege of anticipatory bail.

4. Learned counsel for the State opposes the prayer and submits that this is not a case of simple transportation of liquor rather it is spurious liquor and in view of that the anticipatory bail of the petitioners may kindly be rejected.

5. There is direct allegation against the petitioners of keeping illicit liquor and apprehended co-accused persons have taken the name of these petitioners. It appears that 526 bottles of spurious liquor have been recovered from the house of the petitioner no.1 and petitioner no. 2 is accomplice of the petitioner no. 1.

5. In the attending facts and circumstance of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and accordingly, their prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

6. If the petitioners move before the learned court by way of filing regular bail the same shall be decided in accordance with law without being prejudice to this order.

Dt.01.05.2026 **(Sanjay Kumar Dwivedi, J.)**

satyarthi-