

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15256 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-682 Year-2022 Thana- FATUA District- Patna

Neetu Devi W/o- Somar Saw Resident of Maksudpur, P.S.- Fatuha, District- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Harish Kumar, Advocate
For the State : Mr. Khurshid Anwar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-04-2025 Heard Mr. Harish Kumar, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Khurshid Anwar, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 682 of 2022, F.I.R dated 16.09.2022 registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 20 liters of country made wine from the hut of the petitioner.

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 although the recovery has been made from



the hut in question but it appears from the F.I.R that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner was not present there at the time of recovery. 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. 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 and the



petitioner has clean antecedent, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of her 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 Special Judge Excise, Patna City in connection with Fatuha P.S. Case No. 682 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 her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, 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 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)

priyanka/-

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

