

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26573 of 2026**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-59 Year-2026 Thana- Gaura P.S. District- Saran

Chinta Devi Wife of Late Arjun Manjhi Resident of Village - Gaura, Paswan  
Tola, P.S.- Gaura and District - Saran.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |   |                            |
|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s       | : | Mr. Ankit Kumar Singh      |
|                            |   | Mr. Ranjeet Patel          |
| For the Opposite Party/s : |   | Ms. Indu Kumari Srivastava |

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA**  
**ORAL ORDER**

- 2      22-04-2026                      1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned APP for the State.
2. The petitioner seeks bail in anticipation of her arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of the Excise Act.
3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is a person with clean antecedent and is a woman and allegation is of recovery of 15 litres of liquor from palani of petitioner along with 200 litres of mahua pass which was destroyed apart from other recoveries as alleged in the FIR from palani of different accused.
4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner was not arrested from the spot, as such, nothing was



recovered from her conscious possession and palani is a place outside the house and thus is accessible to public at large. It is further submitted that no prudent person would use her own premises for committing a crime and thus, would create evidence against herself and hence, would get implicated. It is also submitted that she came to be implicated at the instance of Chaukidar with whom her husband is on an inimical term. It is next submitted that Chaukidar in order to coerce her husband into submission falsely implicated the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner, above-named, in the event of her arrest or surrender before the learned Court below within a period of six weeks, is directed to be released on provisional anticipatory bail on her furnishing bail-bonds in the sum of Rs.500/- (Rupees Five Hundred) 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 Gaura P. S. Case No.59 of 2026, 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 petitioner shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in the event, if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of even one case, then it would be presumed that petitioner for the purposes of obtaining anticipatory bail had concealed his 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 petitioner is a person with clean antecedent, in that event, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

vikash/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

