

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.17989 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-121 Year-2025 Thana- MAHUA District- Vaishali

=====

Raushan Chaudhary @ Raushan Kumar Son of Kusheshwar Chaudhary @
Kusesar Chaudhary Resident of Village -Benkunda, Ward no 04, PS -Mahua,
District- Vaishali At Hajipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bijay Bhushan Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Asha Devi, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 21-04-2025 Heard Mr. Bijay Bhushan Prasad, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Ms. Asha Devi, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Mahua P.S. Case No. 121 of 2025, F.I.R. dated
25.01.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 105 liter Indian made foreign
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 it



appears from the F.I.R and seizure list that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the construction house of the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner is not the exclusive owner of the house in question 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 is not the exclusive owner of the house in question 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 Judge-cum-District and Additional Sessions Judge, Vaishali, Hajipur in connection with Mahua P.S. Case No. 121 of 2025,, 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.)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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

