IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58733 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-373 Year-2025 Thana- Raghunathpur District- East Champaran

==========

Sunil Sah S/o Late Rajvanshi Sah @ Rajbansi Sah Resident of Village- Shankar @ Sankar Saraiya, Rama Singh Babu Tola @ Rama Singh Tola, PS- Turkauliya, District- East Champaran

... ... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... ... Opposite Party/s

==========

Appearance :
For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Prasad, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Rabindra Kumar, APP

==========

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA

ORAL ORDER

2 21-08-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.

2. The petitioner seeks bail in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 274, 275 and 3(5) of the BNS, 2023 read with Section 30(a) of the Bihar Excise Act.

3. The learned APP, at the outset, submits that petitioner had earlier moved this Court seeing anticipatory bail by filing Criminal Miscellaneous No. 19674 of 2026 and the petitioner was granted the privilege of provisional anticipatory bail by an order dated 26.03.2026, with a condition that after releasing the petitioner on provisional anticipatory bail, his criminal antecedents would be verified, as in Criminal Miscellaneous No. 19674 of 2026 the petitioner at Para-3 had pleaded that he had antecedent of ten criminal cases, but in the

WEB COPY

instant regular bail application, it is pleaded that petitioner has antecedent of six criminal cases, which amply demonstrates that petitioner earlier had concealed his antecedent when Criminal Miscellaneous No. 19674 of 2026 was filed. It is further submitted that, a person who does not approach the Court with clean hands, should not be shown any leniency. It is further submitted that if privilege of regular bail is granted, the petitioner may abscond or try to tamper with the evidence.

4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner is not in a position to rebut the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, Mr. Rabindra Kumar.

5. After hearing the learned counsel for the parties and taking into consideration the submissions made by the learned APP for the State, the Court is not inclined to release the petitioner on bail.

6. However, the petitioner would be at liberty to renew his prayer for bail after framing of charge.

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

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

U		T	

WEB COPY