

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28854 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-65 Year-2025 Thana- RAGHOPUR District- Vaishali

1. Dinesh Rai Son of Lalu Rai @ Lal Rai @ Laloo Rai village- Jafrabad Dih, P.S.- Rustampur O.P., District -Vaishali
2. Chunu Rai Son of Sagar Rai village- Sukumarpur, P.S.- Rustampur O.P., District -Vaishali
3. Vikash Rai @ Vikash Kumar Son of Police Rai village- Sukumarpur, P.S.- Rustampur O.P., District -Vaishali
4. Krishn Rai @ Krishn Kumar son of Vinay Rai village- Jafrabad Tok, P.S.- Rustampur O.P., District -Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ravish Mishra, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 08-05-2025 Heard Mr. Ravish Mishra, learned counsel for the petitioners and Mr. Shailendra Kumar Singh, learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in connection with Raghopur P.S. Case No. 65 of 2025, F.I.R dated 15.03.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act and Sections 274, 275 and 317(5) of the BNS, 2023.

3. Recovery is of 350 liters of illicit liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that



the petitioner nos. 1 & 3 have clean antecedent and petitioner nos. 2 & 4 carries one criminal antecedent other than the present one but they are on bail in the said case and they have falsely been implicated in the present case on the basis of the disclosure made by the local chowkidar. He further submits that it appears from the F.I.R as well as seizure list that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioners rather the recovery has been made from the place of occurrence. He further submits that the petitioners have no role at all in the present occurrence and except the aforesaid no other material has come during investigation to suggest the involvement of the petitioners in the present occurrence. 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 petitioners under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. Learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners 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 petitioners.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioners and the petitioners have been made accused on the basis of the disclosure made by the local chowkidar, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their 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) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Exclusive Special Prohibition and Excise Court (second)-cum-District and Additional Sessions Judge, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Raghapur P.S. Case No. 65 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. Petitioners 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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

ii. If the petitioners 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 petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. 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)

Vanisha/-

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

