

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.32372 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-59 Year-2024 Thana- SONO District- Jamui

=====

Lalita Devi W/O - Arjun Turi Permanent resident of Village- Baghakol Tola
Bishanpur, P.S.- Charkapathar, District- Jamui, At present resident of Village-
Mirzaganj, P.S.- Jamua (Jamui), District- Giridih (Jharkhand)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Umesh Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Khurshid Anwar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 30-07-2025 Heard Mr. Umesh Prasad, 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 Sono P.S. Case No. 59 of 2024, FIR dated
16.02.2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 272 and 273 of the Indian Penal Code and Section
30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 03 litres country made liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and she has falsely been
implicated in this case. The allegation as alleged in the FIR is
false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any



offence as alleged in the FIR. It appears from the FIR as well as the seizure list that nothing has been recovered from 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 registered owner of the motorcycle in question. There is non-compliance with mandatory procedure prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of Cr.P.C./Section 103 of BNSS, 2023. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for 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) PLJR 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 petitioner has clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has been made accused merely on the ground that she is registered owner of the motorcycle in question, 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 learned Exclusive Excise Court-II, Jamui in connection with Sono P.S. Case No. 59 of 2024, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ Section 482(2) of BNSS, 2023 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)

Neha/-

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

