

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26400 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-51 Year-2025 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Katihar

Sonu Kumar S/o Arun Mahto @ Arun Kumar Mahto R/o Village/ Mohalla-
Baharkhal (Ramaili), P.S.- Rautara, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bimal Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 05-05-2025 Heard Mr. Bimal Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Binod Kumar, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Katihar Excise P.S. Case No. 51 of 2025, F.I.R
dated 12.02.2025 registered for the offences punishable under
Section 30(a) and 45 of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 244.920 liters of foreign liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is innocent 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 that nothing has been recovered from the
conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has



been made from the maize field which is an open place. 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. He further submit that the petitioner carries one criminal antecedent other than the present one but fairly submits on the basis of paragraph-3 of the bail application that the petitioner is on bail in the said matter.

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 recovery of illicit liquor has been made from maize field which is an open place, 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 Additional District and Sessions Judge, Exclusive Special Excise, Court No.1, Katihar in connection with Katihar Excise P.S. Case No. 51 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)

Suruchi/-

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

