

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.39961 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-20 Year-2025 Thana- SITAMARHI District- Nawada

Pinki Kumari @ Pinki Devi Son of Sandeep Chaudhary @ Sandip Chaudhari
Resident Of Village -Bajjnathpur, P.S- Sitamarhi, Dist- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The state of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Khurshid Anwar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-06-2025 Heard Mr. Vibhuti Ranjan Sonvadra, learned counsel
for the petitioner and Mr. Khurshid Anwar, learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest connection with Sitamarhi P.S. Case No. 20 of 2025, F.I.R. dated 13.02.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition & Excise Act, 2016.

3. Recovery is of 21 liters of country made liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and she has falsely been implicated in the present case merely on the ground that she is the owner of the motorcycle in question. 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



and altogether 21 litres of country made liquor was recovered from the motorcycle in question and she has been made accused merely on the ground that she is the owner of the motorcycle in question. 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.

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 and the fact that



nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and recovery has been made from the motorcycle in question and she has been made accused merely on the ground that she is the owner of the motorcycle in question, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of her 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 Exclusive Special Excise Court-I, Nawada in connection with Sitamarhi PS. Case No. 20 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 her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, her 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 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)

Ibrar//-

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

