

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.9296 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-282 Year-2017 Thana- MAKHDUMPUR District- Jehanabad

1. Naresh Manjhi S/O Late Shugi Manjhi R/O Village - Sumera (Mahadalit Tola) P.S- Makhdumpur, District- Jehanabad (Bihar)
2. Mugeshwar Manjhi S/O Late Jamuna Manjhi R/O Village - Sumera (Mahadalit Tola) P.S- Makhdumpur, District- Jehanabad (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sudhir Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Indu Kumari Srivastava, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RUDRA PRAKASH MISHRA

ORAL ORDER

2 12-02-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned APP for the State.

2. The petitioners seek bail in connection with Makhdumpur P.S. Case No. 282 of 2017 (Excise Case No. 1834 of 2017) instituted for the offences under Sections 30(a)(d) and 37(a)(b)(d) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. The present case is misuse of privilege of bail earlier granted to the petitioners. Earlier, the petitioners have been granted regular bail vide order dated 21.11.2017 by the learned Spl. Excise Court-I, Jehanabad. He further submits



that due to non-appearance of petitioners, the bail bonds of the petitioners got cancelled vide order dated 14.06.2023. Thereafter, petitioners were again enlarged on bail on 04.06.2025 with direction to the petitioners to appear in the Court. But due to non-appearance of the petitioners their bail bonds were cancelled on 09.06.2025. Thereafter, petitioners have been arrested on 30.11.2025. Learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners have not been given any information regarding cancellation of his bail bond by his counsel. Learned counsel for the petitioners further submits that the petitioners undertake to abide by any conditions imposed by this Court, if released on bail.

4. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of bail to the petitioner. He further submitted that due non-appearance of the petitioners charge has not been framed.

5. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, as also the period of custody undergone by the petitioner as also the undertaking given by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Let the petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs. 15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen



Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of Court below/concerned Court in connection withMakhdumpur P.S. Case No. 282 of 2017 (Excise Case No. 1834 of 2017), subject to the following conditions:

(I) One of the bailors shall be the petitioners' own or close member.

(II) The petitioners shall appear on each and every date fixed during the trial and shall not remain absent on two consecutive dates without sufficient cause.

(III) The petitioners shall not tamper with the prosecution evidence or influence/intimidate any witness during the course of trial.

In case of violation of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Trial Court shall be at liberty to cancel the bail bonds of the petitioners.

(Rudra Prakash Mishra, J)

manish/-

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

