

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43034 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-36 Year-2025 Thana- MALAHI District- East Champaran

Sheopujan Manjhi S/o Late Jattu Manjhi Malahi Dargah Tola, P.S.- Malahi,
District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Shankar Shrivastava, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-07-2025 Heard Mr. Vijay Shankar Shrivastava, learned
counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Tar learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Malahi P.S. Case No. 36 of 2025, F.I.R dated
27.01.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 42 liters of country made wine.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has clean antecedent and has falsely been
implicated in the present case on the basis of suspicion. 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
and seizure list that nothing has been recovered from the



conscious possession of the petitioner and altogether 42 liters of the country made wine was recovered from the backside of the house of the petitioner. He further submits that as per allegation in the F.I.R., the villagers have informed the police that the petitioner was there and he was escaped from the place of occurrence and the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of illicit liquor and has been made accused in the present case merely on the basis of disclosure made by the local villagers.

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, the name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of the disclosure made by the local villagers and the petitioner has clean antecedent, 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 No. 1, East Champaran at Motihari in connection with Malahi P.S. Case No. 36 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)

Jyoti Kumari/-

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

