

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5093 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-384 Year-2024 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Nitesh Kumar @ Nitish Kumar S/O Rama Shankar Rai @ Razaje Rai
Resident of Village- Kodiya, P.S- Gadha, Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Jyoti Kumari, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-02-2025 Heard Ms. Jyoti Kumari, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 384 of 2024, F.I.R dated 26.10.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 4.930 liters of foreign liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case on the basis of the suspicion. He further submits that it appears from the F.I.R as well as seizure list that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery have been made near the house of



the petitioner and only on the basis of the suspicion the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. There is non-compliance with mandatory procedure prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of Cr.P.C./ Section 103 of B.N.S.S., 2023. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State, on the other hand, has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner referring the provision contained in Section 76(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act and submitted that the pre-arrest bail would not be maintainable. He further submits that the petitioner carries three more cases in similar nature of the offence other than the present one but fairly submits on the basis of the paragraph no.3 of the bail petition that the petitioner is on bail in the pending matters.

6. This court is aware of the decision of the Full Bench in the case of *Ram Vinay Yadav vs. State of Bihar reported in 2019(2) P.L.J.R. 1089*. Having regard to the law laid down in the aforesaid judgment and the submission advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court, for the limited purpose of grant of anticipatory bail, is inclined to accept the submission of counsel for the petitioner.



7. Considering the aforesaid facts that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order, be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Exclusive Special Excise Judge 1st, Sitamarhi in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 384 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S., 2023 and with other following conditions:-

i. Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioner tampers with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

iii. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at



any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

ajay/-

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

