

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67676 of 2021**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-41 Year-2021 Thana- LAUKARIA District- West Champaran

1. MAHENDRA SAH S/O SRI KASHI SAH R/o village- Bhalu Tola, P.S.-  
Laukariya, District- West Champaran
2. Ranjha Uraon @ Renjha Uraon S/o Late Ramautar Uraon R/o village- Bhalu  
Tola, P.S.- Laukariya, District- West Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Umesh Chandra Verma  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ARVIND SRIVASTAVA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

2      29-04-2022                      Heard both sides.

Petitioners apprehend their arrest in Laukariya P.S.  
Case No.41 of 2021 registered under Section 30(a) of the Bihar  
Prohibition and Excise Act.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the  
petitioners have committed no offence and have falsely been  
implicated in this case. It is further submitted that nothing has  
been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioners.  
The petitioners have got no criminal antecedent.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has opposed the prayer for  
bail of petitioner no.1 by contending that the alleged recovery of  
liquor has been made from the house of petitioner no.1.

Therefore, petitioner no.1 does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Having considered the above facts and circumstances of the case, petitioner no.2, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned court below within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt/production of a copy of this order, are directed to be enlarged on bail on furnishing personal bond to the satisfaction of learned Special Judge, Excise, West Champaran at Bettiah in connection with Laukariya P.S. Case No.41 of 2021 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

So far as petitioner no.1 is concerned, considering the facts and circumstances of the case as well as the nature of allegation made against him, this Court is not inclined to enlarge petitioner no.1 (Mahendra Sah) on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, his prayer for bail is rejected.

**(Arvind Srivastava, J)**

Harish/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|