

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.14021 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-215 Year-2022 Thana- DUMRA District- Sitamarhi

Nagendra Mukhiya Son of Sarikhan Mukhiya village- Shivhar, Ward no. 11,
Ps- Dumra, Dist- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, Advocate.
Mrs. Divya Bharti, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shyam Bihari Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 23-04-2025 Heard Mr. Pushpendra Kumar Singh, learned
counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Shyam Bihari Singh, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Dumra P.S. Case No. 215 of 2022, F.I.R dated
22.05.2022 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 30(a) & 37(c) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act,
2018.

3. Recovery is of 1 liter of country made liquor.

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 that nothing has been recovered from the



conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the house of the petitioner. It appears from the seizure list that one liter of country made liquor along with some apparatus used in the preparation of liquor has been recovered from the place of occurrence and the petitioner fled away from the said place of occurrence. He further submits that the petitioner is not the exclusive owner of the house in question rather the same is the joint house property of the petitioner and the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of the illicit liquor or with the other articles. 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 nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner, the house in question is the joint house property of the petitioner and the petitioner has clean antecedent, 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 Excise Court-I, Sitamarhi in connection with Dumra P.S. Case No. 215 of 2022, 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	
---	--	---	--

