

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.36354 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-35 Year-2025 Thana- BISFI District- Madhubani

Sanjai Thakur @ Sanjai Kumar S/o Sri Jyoteesh Thakur R/o- Raghauli, P.S -
Bisfi, District - Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Priyadarshi Matri Sharan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Md. Ataur Rahman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-06-2025 Heard Mr. Priyadarshi Matri Sharan, learned
counsel for the petitioner and Md. Ataur Rahman, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Bisfi P.S. Case No. 35 of 2025, F.I.R dated
01.03.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) and 41 of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

3. Recovery is of 1232.700 liters of foreign liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is innocent and he has falsely been 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 the recovery
has been made from the cattle shed of the co-accused,



Dhananjai Thakur and the petitioner has been made accused in the present case only on the ground that he is full brother of the co-accused, Dhananjai Thakur. He further submits that the apart from the aforesaid, local chowkidar has also disclosed the fact that the petitioner was involved in the present crime in question. He further submits that the allegation as alleged in the F.I.R. is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. 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. 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 one criminal antecedent other than the present one but fairly submits on the basis of paragraph 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner is on bail in the pending 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 that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of the disclosure made by local chowkidar, 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 Special Judge (Excise Court), Madhubani in connection with Bisfi P.S. Case No. 35 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)

Vanisha/-

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

