

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.19631 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-22 Year-2025 Thana- MADHUBANI TOWN District-
Madhubani

=====

Pintu Mahato S/o Late Ramchandra Mahto Resident of Village- Sidhiniya
Chok Stadium Road No. 32, P.S.- Town, District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravi Prakash, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Manoj Kumar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 23-04-2025 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence punishable under Section 30(a) of the
Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act, 2022.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner is a person with clean antecedent.

4. Allegation is of recovery of 33 litres of liquor from
the house of the petitioner and 3.9 litres of liquor from the house
of Santosh Mahto.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner was not arrested from the spot, as such, nothing was
recovered from his conscious possession and after amendment
in the Excise Act in the year 2018, the concept of deemed



possession and presumed offender has been done away with. It is further submitted that the house in question is a joint family property, as such, it cannot be alleged with certainty that it was the petitioner who had kept the liquor in the house or the liquor kept in the house was within his knowledge. It is next submitted that petitioner came to be implicated at the instance of the local people but then the name of the person who disclosed the name of the petitioner is not disclosed in the FIR which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution. It is also submitted that the police mechanically implicate either at the instance of the Chawkidar, local people, secret information or confessional statement without holding proper investigation of the case.

6. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, let the petitioner above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on provisional anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court below where the case is pending/successor court in connection with



Madhubani Town P.S. Case No. 22 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) of the Cr.P.C.

8. It is made clear that thereafter the learned trial court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of even one case, it would be presumed that petitioner had concealed his antecedent before this Court at para 3 of the anticipatory bail application in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed but if it is found on verification that petitioner is a person with clean antecedent in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

