

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.11022 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-600 Year-2024 Thana- GARKHA District- Saran

Munni Kumari Wife of Jaikkee Thakur Resident of Village - Rahampur, P.S.-
Garkha, District - Saran at Chapra (Bihar).

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Sangeeta Sharma, APP

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

3 05-05-2025 Heard Mr. Rakesh Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Ms. Sangeeta Sharma, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in
connection with Garkha P.S. Case No. 600 of 2024, F.I.R dated
23.09.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 4 liters of country made liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has clean antecedent and has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that the
allegation as alleged in the F.I.R is false and fabricated. He
further submits that the it appears from the F.I.R that nothing
has been recovered from the conscious possession of the



petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the motorcycle in question and she has been made accused merely on the ground that she is the owner of the motorcycle in question.

5. The 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, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner, the petitioner has clean antecedent and the petitioner has been made accused merely on the basis of that she is the owner of the motorcycle in question, 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 1st Exclusive Special Excise Court, Saran at Chapra in connection with Garkha P.S. Case No. 600 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 her 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 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)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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

