

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84636 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-245 Year-2025 Thana- KOPA District- Saran

-
1. Satrudhan Manjhi, Son of Late Ram Vriksh Manjhi, R/o Village - Pokharbhinda, P.S. - Kopa, Dist. - Saran at Chapra.
 2. Chandeshwar Manjhi, Son of Chandrama Manjhi, R/o Village - Pokharbhinda, P.S. - Kopa, Dist. - Saran at Chapra.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, Adv.

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHAILENDRA SINGH
ORAL ORDER

2 17-12-2025 At the outset, learned counsel for the petitioners seeks permission to withdraw the prayer of the petitioner no.1 namely, Satrudhan Manjhi, as he has been arrested and his prayer has become infructuous, as such, he wants to withdraw his prayer from this petition and in this regard, permission is required.

2. Permission as sought above is granted.

3. The prayer made by the petitioner No. 1 namely, Satrudhan Manjhi, stands dismissed as withdrawn.

4. Heard Mr. Ajit Kumar Singh, learned counsel for the petitioner and Mr. Kumar Ranjit Ranjan, learned APP for the State.

5. The petitioner no. 2 (Chandeshwar Manjhi)



apprehends his arrest in connection with Kopa P. S. Case No. 245 of 2025 dated 19.09.2025 registered for the offence(s) punishable under Section(s) 30 (a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

6. The main submissions advanced by the learned counsel for the petitioners are that the recovery of the alleged liquor is said to have been made from the Dalan covered by the asbestos sheets belonging to two persons namely, Ramashankar Manjhi and Dinesh Manjhi with whom the petitioner no.2 has no connection or relation and the petitioner no.2 has been made accused mainly on the basis of the information given by the local persons, who had gathered at the place of recovery during the raid however, in the FIR, their names have not been disclosed, so, without any basis and in the absence of admissible evidence, the said petitioner has been made accused, and the alleged offence of the Excise Act under which the FIR has been registered does not attract even prima facie against the petitioner and therefore his prayer is not hit by the provisions of Section 76(2) of the said Act.

7. Though, learned APP appearing for the State has opposed the bail prayer of the petitioner but he has not been able to point out any incriminating admissible material against the



petitioner.

8. In the facts and circumstances of this case and considering the above submissions, this court is inclined to grant the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner no.2. Accordingly, let the petitioner no. 2 named-above, in the event of his arrest/surrender before the learned court below within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail in connection with Kopa P. S. Case No. 245 of 2025 on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the Court concerned, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482(2) of the BNSS.

(Shailendra Singh, J)

Rajiv/-

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

