

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5469 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-270 Year-2025 Thana- CHIRAIYA District- East Champaran

1. Appu Manjhi Son of Sudama Manjhi R/o Village - Manguraha, Dhangar Toil, P.S. - Chiraiya, Dist. - East Champaran.
2. Pappu Manjhi Son of Sudama Manjhi R/o Village - Manguraha, Dhangar Toil, P.S. - Chiraiya, Dist. - East Champaran.
3. Sudama Manjhi Son of Faguni Manjhi R/o Village - Manguraha, Dhangar Toil, P.S. - Chiraiya, Dist. - East Champaran.
4. Pargan Manjhi Son of Late Batahu Manjhi R/o Village - Manguraha, Dhangar Toil, P.S. - Chiraiya, Dist. - East Champaran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Roshan Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Harendra Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 02-02-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in anticipation of their arrest
in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections
30(a) and 41(1) of the Excise Act.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
the petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and the allegation
is of recovery of 50 litres of liquor from house of the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
petitioners were not arrested from the spot, as such, nothing was
recovered from their conscious possession and even the house in



question is a joint family property and thus, it cannot be alleged with certainty that it was the petitioner, who had kept the liquor in the house or the liquor kept in the house was within his knowledge and after Amendment in the Excise Act, 2018, the concept of deemed possession and presumed offender has been done away with and the petitioner they came to be implicated at the instance of Chaukidar, but then, if Chaukidar was aware of the involvement of the petitioners in the occurrence, then why he did not inform the police prior to institution of the present F.I.R., which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution, when admittedly petitioners are persons with clean antecedent.

5. Learned A.P.P. opposes the anticipatory bail application.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners, above-named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on provisional anticipatory bail on their furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/ successor Court in connection with Chiraiya P. S. Case No.270 of 2025, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C.



7. The application stands allowed.

8. It is made clear that the learned trial Court after accepting the provisional bail bonds of the petitioners shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in the event, if it is found that petitioners have antecedent of even one case, then it would be presumed that petitioners for the purposes of obtaining anticipatory bail had concealed their antecedent before this Court, in that event, the present provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed, but if on verification, it is found that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent, in that event, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

9. At this stage, the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner based on instruction submits that petitioner undertakes to deposit an amount of Rs.3,000/- with Lawyers Association, Patna High Court, Patna within a period of two weeks from today.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

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

