

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40069 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-134 Year-2012 Thana- GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP.
District- Jamui

=====

Ravi Singh @ Ravindra Singh Son of Late Sakhi Singh R/o Vill- Indpey, P.S
Jamui, Distt.- Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Parmanand Prasad, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 03-07-2025 Heard Mr. Pankaj Kumar Sinha, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Parmanand Prasad, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Complaint Case No. 134C2 of 2012, F.I.R.
dated 15.04.2000 for the offences punishable under Sections
47(a) and (2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. The allegation against the petitioner is that
5.000 litres of illegal country made liquor and 250.000 kg
fermented Mahua was recovered from the possession of
petitioner and the same was seized.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has clean antecedent and he 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 and the petitioners have not committed any offences as alleged in the F.I.R. He further submits that from perusal of the F.I.R. it appears that 5 litres of country made liquor and 250 kg of the fermented Mahua were recovered from the so called hut of the petitioner. He further submits that the petitioner has no such house in the district and apart from that from the perusal of the F.I.R., it appears that the occurrence took place on 15.04.2008 but the present F.I.R. has been instituted on 27.01.2012 after delay of about four years and only to falsely implicate the petitioner and apart from that the petitioner has no knowledge about the present case and when the NBW issued against the petitioner on 21.08.2024 then then he came to know about the present case, thereafter, he approached before the learned Court below for the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for bail of the petitioners.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts, nothing has recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has clean antecedent, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of 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 Excise Court- II, Jamui in connection with Complaints Case No. 134C2 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/482(2) of the B.N.S.S., 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 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 petitioners. 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)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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

