

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20770 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-180 Year-2025 Thana- KANHAULI District- Sitamarhi

Pramod Ram S/o- Bindeshwar Ram Resident of Village- Dayankothi Dayan
Chhapara Ward No. 2, P.S.- Majorganj, District- Sitamarhi

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s	:	Mr. Birendra Kumar, Advocate
For the State	:	Mrs. Sucheta Yadav, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJIV ROY
ORAL ORDER

2 08-04-2026 Heard Mr. Birendra Kumar, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mrs. Sucheta Yadav, learned APP
representing the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kanhauli P.S. Case No. 180 of 2025 for the offence under sections 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act lodged on 29.11.2025 by the informant, Shambhu Paswan.

3. As per the prosecution story, the informant alleged that during vehicle inspection, from a Mopped there is recover/seizure of 108 liter Nepali Liquor. This led to the FIR.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that he is not the owner of the Mopped but has been falsely implicated



only because of one criminal antecedent.

5. Further, learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the judgment of the Full Bench of Hon'ble Patna High Court in the case of **Ram Vinay Yadav vs. State of Bihar** reported in **2019 (2) PLJR 1089** wherein it has been held that an application for anticipatory bail in a case arising out of Bihar Excise and Prohibition Act can be maintained, despite the bar under Section 76(2) of the Act, if on the basis of allegation made in the FIR, no offence under the said provision is made out.

6. Learned APP opposes the prayer submitting that he has criminal antecedent.

7. Taking into account the submissions of the parties and the judgment in the case of **Ram Vinay Yadav (supra)**, as also that the categorical statement that he is not the owner of the vehicle, nothing recovered from his conscious possession, in that background, this Court is inclined to extend him the privilege of anticipatory bail with conditions.

8. Let the petitioner be released on bail in the event of arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the receipt of this order, on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the



satisfaction of learned Exclusive Special Excise Court-I, Sitamarhi in connection with Kanhauli P.S. Case No. 180 of 2025 subject to the following conditions:

(i) one of the bailor should be the family member/relative of the petitioner who shall provide official document to show his/her bona fide;

(ii) the petitioner shall be appearing before the Police Station as and when required for cooperating in the investigation;

(iii) the petitioner shall appear on each and every date before the Trial Court and failure to do so for two consecutive dates without plausible reason will entail cancellation of his bail bond by the Trial Court itself;

(iv) the petitioner shall appear before the concerned police station every fortnight for six months to mark his attendance and after the end of the period, the certificate shall be submitted before the Trial Court failing which steps shall be taken for the cancellation of the bail bonds;

(v) the petitioner shall in no way try to induce or promise or threat the witnesses or tamper with the evidences, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of the bail bonds;



(vi) the petitioner shall desist from committing any criminal offence again, failing which the State shall be at liberty to take steps for cancellation of his bail bonds.

(Rajiv Roy, J)

vinayak/-

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

