

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35570 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-92 Year-2025 Thana- Jaitpur District- Muzaffarpur

Chandeshwar Manjhi S/o Sam Nath Manjhi R/o Till, Beahata, Berua, District-
Muzaffarpur, Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Ramchandra Sahni, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RITESH KUMAR
ORAL ORDER

2 21-05-2026 Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in connection with Jaitpur P.S. Case No. 92 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under sections 274, 275, 3(5) of the B.N.S. and section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition & Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution story which has been lodged on the basis of the written report submitted by the informant to the effect that on 11.06.2025 at about 05.30 P.M., when the informant along with police party reached near Kargil Chowk, the informant received confidential information that all the FIR named accused person including the petitioner, were engaged in manufacturing and selling country made liquor from their respective houses. The informant along with police party



proceeded to verify the authenticity of the information and conducted raid at the houses of the accused persons. During course of the raid, 05 litres of illicit country made liquor was recovered from the house of the petitioner and 10 litres of country made liquor was recovered from other co-accused persons named in the F.I.R., thus, total 15 litres of country made liquor was recovered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence. He has been made accused in this case due to some *mala fide* intention. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner was not apprehended at the place of occurrence. He further submits that petitioner has got a clean antecedent.

5. The learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for bail of the petitioner.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the parties and after going through the records, it appears that the petitioner was not present at the place of occurrence. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has got a clean antecedent. Considering the same, let the above named petitioner, in the



event of arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Exclusive Special Judge, Excise II, Muzaffarpur in connection with Jaitpur P.S. Case No. 92 of 2025, subject to conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure/ 482(2) of the Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 with further condition:

(i) The trial court shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedents, the court concerned shall take step for cancellation of bail bonds of the petitioner. However, the acceptance of bail bonds in terms of the above-mentioned order shall not be delayed for purpose of or in the name of verification.

(Ritesh Kumar, J)

vinita/-

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

