

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24484 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-245 Year-2025 Thana- BOCHAHAN District- Muzaffarpur

1. Sushil Sahani Son of Jagdeep Sahani Resident of Village- Balthi Rasulpur, P.S.- Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur
2. Sarita Devi Wife of Sushil Sahani Resident of Village- Balthi Rasulpur, P.S.- Bochaha, District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mritunjay Kumar Nirala, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-04-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 274 and 275 of the BNS, 2023 read with Section 30(a) of the Bihar Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent and petitioner no. 2 is a woman and allegation is of recovery of 6 liters of liquor along with 40 liters of Jawa Mahua solution from the house of the petitioners and 20 liters of liquor from house of Nanki Sahni.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners were not apprehended from the spot as such nothing was recovered from their conscious possession and the house in question is a joint family property, as such, it cannot be alleged with certainty that it were petitioners who had kept the liquor in the house or the liquor kept in the house was within their knowledge and after amendment in the excise act in the year 2018, the concept of deemed possession and presumed offender has been done away with and they came to be implicated at the instance of Chowkidar with whom petitioner no. 1 is on an inimical term. It is also submitted that if Chowkidar was aware of the involvement of the petitioners in the occurrence then why he did not inform the police prior to institution of the instant FIR which casts an aspersion on the case of the prosecution.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

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 Trial Court within a period of six weeks from today, be released on **Provisional anticipatory bail** on furnishing bail bonds 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 Bochaha P.S. Case No. 245 of 2025 subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 482 (2) of the BNSS.

7. It is made clear that thereafter the learned Trial Court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in the event if it is found that any of the petitioners have antecedent of even one case then it would be presumed that petitioners, for the purposes of seeking anticipatory bail, had concealed their antecedent before this Court, as such, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed with respect to that petitioner who had concealed his criminal antecedent, but after verification if it is found that petitioners are persons with clean antecedent in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Rishabh/-

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

