

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48224 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-308 Year-2025 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Guttu Ram @ Guddu Ram S/o Ramkeshi Ram R/o Village- Mokri, P.S.-
Bhabhua, District- Kaimur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Ms. Kiran Kumari Sharma, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Anita Kumari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 06-08-2025 Heard Ms. Kiran Kumari Sharma, learned counsel
for the petitioner and Ms. Anita Kumari, learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest connection
with Excise P.S. Bhabhua Case No. 308 of 2025, F.I.R. dated
02.05.2025 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 30(a), 32(i) & (iii), 41(1) & (2) of the Bihar
Prohibition & Excise (Amendment) Act, 2022.

3. Recovery is of 16.200 liters of illicit liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. She 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



rather recovery has been made from the E-rickshaw in question and altogether 16.200 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the E-rickshaw in question. It appears from the F.I.R. that the driver of the E-rickshaw and other co-accused person namely Jackie Kumar and Dundun Sharma were apprehended along with illicit liquor and E-rickshaw in question. She further submits that the petitioner has been made accused merely on the ground that he is the registered owner of the E-rickshaw in question and he has given the E-rickshaw to the driver namely Jackie Kumar who was apprehended along with illicit liquor. 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 that the petitioner having clean antecedent and nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner rather recovery has been made from the E-rickshaw and petitioner has been made accused merely on the ground that he is the owner of the E-rickshaw 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 learned Special Judge Excise-II, Kaimur at Bhabhua in connection with Excise PS. Bhabhua Case No. 308 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 his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his 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 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)

Ibrar//-

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

