

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5245 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-301 Year-2022 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

Amrika Ranjan @ Pintu Yadav @ Abhiranjan Yadav Son of Rajeshwar Yadav
@ Jogeshwar Yadav Resident of Village- Bhirkhi Ward No.22 (Dih Tola),PS-
Madhepura, Distt.- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vijay Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pronoti Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 15-02-2025 Heard Mr.Vijay Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Ms.Pronoti Singh, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Madhepura (Excise) P.S.Case No.301 of
2022,FIR dated 11.07.2022 registered for the offences
punishable under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise
Amendment Act, 2018.

3. Recovery is of 100 liters of wiscof cough syrup.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. Further submits that it appears
from the FIR that the recovery has been made from the vehicle



in question and petitioner is neither the owner nor the driver of the vehicle in question and name of the petitioner has been transpired during investigation on the basis of the disclosure made by co-accused person, namely, Sumit Kumar and except the aforesaid, no other material has come during investigation against the petitioner to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence. There is non-compliance with mandatory procedure prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of Cr.P.C./Section 103 of BNSS, 2023. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioners under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for 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.

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) PLJR 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, petitioner has clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and name of the petitioner has been transpired during investigation on the basis of the disclosure made by co-accused person, namely, Sumit Kumar, 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 (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned A.D.J.-VII-cum-Special Judge, Excise-II, Madhepura in connection with Madhepura (Excise) P.S.Case No.301 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of BNSS, 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/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her 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/her 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)

Nitesh/-

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

