

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.7951 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-922 Year-2025 Thana- MADHEPURA District- Madhepura

Sonu Kumar S/o Late Upendra Yadav R/o Village- Chitti, Ward No.01, P.S.-
Ghailarh, District- Madhepura

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar
2. Abhijeet Anand S/o Sri Ajeet Kumar at present BSO Ghailarh Block
Madhepura

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Vijay Anand, Advocate
		Mr. Roop Kishan, Advocate
For the Opposite Party/s	:	Mr. Jagdhar Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DR. ANSHUMAN
ORAL ORDER

3 01-04-2026 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending arrest in connection
with Madhepura (Ghailarh O.P.) P.S. Case No. 922 of 2025,
dated 13.09.2025, lodged under Section 7 of the E.C. Act 1955.

3. As per the prosecution, an FIR has been lodged
against the present petitioner with the allegation that, upon
physical inspection of the godown, the rice and wheat were not
found appropriate.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner is innocent and has committed no offence. Counsel
further submits that the petitioner is a PDS dealer who has been



subsequently authorised to run the shop of another dealer, Dilip Ram, who has been found involved in black marketing. Counsel further submits that it has been alleged against the present petitioner that he was involved in the black marketing of 154.30 quintals of rice and 64.55 quintals of wheat, which is not correct. During the inspection referred to in the first paragraph, it was alleged that such a shortage existed, however, there is no such shortage in the E-POS of the petitioner. Rather, the corresponding E-POS showing such shortage relates to the earlier dealer. Under this wrong impression, the Block Rationing Officer has filed the present case against the petitioner.

5. Learned APP for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner and submits that the allegation of black marketing is specifically mentioned in the FIR.

6. Upon perusal of the records, it transpires to this Court that, vide its order dated 17.02.2026, no coercive action was granted in favour of the petitioner, and Opposite Party No. 2 was directed to appear physically on the next appointed date. Opposite Party No. 2 appeared physically, however, on that date, the case could not be taken up.

7. As such, in the present facts and circumstances of this case, and particularly considering that the operative part of



the FIR is in contradiction with the first paragraph of the FIR itself, let the above named petitioner be released on anticipatory bail, in the event of arrest or surrender before the Trial Court within a period of 4 weeks from today, on furnishing bail bond of Rs.30,000/- (Rupees Thirty Thousand) as mentioned in Section 2(1)(d) of the BNSS, 2023 to the satisfaction of C.J.M., Madhepura, in connection with Madhepura (Ghailarh O.P.) P.S. Case No. 922 of 2025, subject to the conditions as laid down U/s 482(2) of the BNSS, 2023.

(Dr. Anshuman, J.)

Aman Kumar/-

U			
---	--	--	--

