

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38201 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-50 Year-2025 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Muzaffarpur

Mahesh Kumar S/o Rameshwar Prasad R/o Vill- Kanti, Pakari, P.S.- Kanti,
Distt- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Priyesh Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Nirala, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 19-06-2025 Heard Mr. Priyesh Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Nirala, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Excise P.S. Case No. 50 of 2025, F.I.R dated
10.01.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a), 32(3) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 17.280 liters of foreign liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has clean antecedent and has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that the
allegation as alleged in the F.I.R is false and fabricated. He
further submits that it appears from the F.I.R that nothing has
been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner



rather the recovery has been made from the vehicle in question and the petitioner is made accused merely on the basis that he is the owner of the vehicle in question. Initially the petitioner was not named in the FIR and his name transpired during investigation. 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. 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, nothing has been



recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has clean antecedent and the petitioner is made accused merely on the basis that he is the owner of the vehicle 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 the learned Exclusive Special Judge Excise-II, Muzaffarpur in connection with Excise P.S. Case No. 50 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)

Suruchi/-

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

