

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48386 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-99 Year-2025 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Jamui

Sajni Devi S/o Sarwan Paswan R/o Village- Daulatpur, P.S.- Jamui, District-
Jamui

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Niranjan Parihar, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-08-2025 Heard Mr.Niranjan Parihar, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr.Anil Kumar, learned Additional Public
Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in
connection with JAM P.S.Case No.99 of 2025, FIR dated
02.02.2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 20 liters of illicit 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. The allegation as alleged in the
FIR is false and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed
any offence as alleged in the FIR. It appears from the FIR as



well as the seizure list that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the motorcycle in question and one person, namely, Sohit Sharma @ Sohit Kumar was apprehended and he has confessed that Sharwan Paswan was also accompanied with him and he has escaped from the place of occurrence. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is wife of Sarwan Paswan and petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on the ground that she is owner of the vehicle in question from which the recovery has been made. 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. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for 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) PLJR 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, petitioner has clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and petitioner has been made accused in the present case merely on the ground that she is owner of the vehicle 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 Excise Court-II, Jamui in connection with JAM P.S.Case No.99 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:-

(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/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her 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/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)

Nitesh/-

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

