

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.30527 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-161 Year-2025 Thana- SONEPUR District- Saran

Sujit Rai @ Sujit Singh Yadav Son of Mangal Rai R/O- Vill- Rahimpur, P.S-
Sonpur, Distt- Saran at Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shakti Suman Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Asha Kumari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 14-05-2025 Heard Mr. Shakti Suman Kumar, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mrs. Asha Kumari, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest connection
with Sonapur P.S. Case No. 161 of 2025, F.I.R. dated
23.02.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition & Excise Act, 2016.

3. Recovery is of 225 liters of country made liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and on the basis of disclosure made by
local choudidar the name of the petitioner has been falsely
implicated in the present case. 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 petitioner rather



recovery has been made from the diara area in the bank of Ganga river and petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of illicit liquor and he has been made accused on the basis of disclosure made by local choukidar and except the aforesaid, no other cogent material has come during investigation to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to 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. 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 submits that the petitioner carries two more cases other than the present one.

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 that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of disclosure made by local choukidar, 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 2nd Exclusive Special Excise Judge, Saran at Chapra in connection with Sonpur PS. Case No. 161 of 2025, 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:-

1. 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.

2. 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.

3. 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)

Ibrar//-

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

