

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8646 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-93 Year-2024 Thana- CHENARI District- Rohtas

Vikash Kumar S/o Kedar Singh R/o Village- Manhanian, P.S- Tilauthu,
District- Rohtas at Sasaram.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Parwej Khan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-03-2025 Heard Mr. Parwej Khan, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Chenari P.S. Case No. 93 of 2024, F.I.R dated
20.03.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016 (Amendment
2022).

3. Recovery is of 20 liters of country made wine.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. 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 has been made from the motorcycle in question and the petitioner has been made accused only on the ground that he is the owner of the said motorcycle in question. He further submits that in fact, the vehicle of the petitioner was stolen by someone and for that he has also reported before the Sasaram Police Station on 08.01.2024 and the present occurrence has taken place on 20.03.2024. There is non-compliance with mandatory procedure prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of Cr.P.C / Section 103 of Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor 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.

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 the petitioner has clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and he has been made accused only on the ground that he is owner of the vehicle in question but in fact, the said vehicle has been stolen for which he has reported in the Police Station on 08.01.2024, 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 the learned Exclusive Special Judge, Excise Court No. 1, Rohtas at Sasaram in connection with Chenari P.S. Case No. 93 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure / Section 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita 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)

Vanisha/-

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

