

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28918 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-143 Year-2021 Thana- JAYNAGAR District- Madhubani

Suraj Sahni S/O Rajendra Sahni Resident of Village- Barhi, PS- Jaynagar,
District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shailendra Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Iftexhar Mahmood, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 12-05-2025 Heard Mr.Shailendra Kumar Jha, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr.Md. Iftexhar Mahmood, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Jaynagar P.S.Case No.143 of 2021,
corresponding to G.R.No.815/2021, FIR dated 15.05.2021
registered for the offences punishable under Section 414 of IPC
and Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

3. Recovery is of 212.7 liters of Nepali country made
Saurav Saufi liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in
the present case. 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 the petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on the ground that he is owner of the motorcycle in question and altogether 44.70 liters of illicit liquor has been recovered from the motorcycle of the petitioner. 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, petitioner has clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on the ground that he is owner of the motorcycle in question, 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 learned Additional Sessions Judge-II-cum-Special Judge, Excise Act, Madhubani in connection with Jaynagar P.S.Case No.143 of 2021, 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 his/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/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 his/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)

Nitesh/-

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

