

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.163 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-398 Year-2025 Thana- HARSIDHI District- East Champaran

Ajay Manjhi S/O Late Banu Manjhi Resident of Village- Harsidhi Mushahari
Tola, Ward No 4, Police Station- Harsidhi, District- East Champaran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Karandeep Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Parmanand Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 13-01-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of the
Bihar Excise Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has antecedent of five case under the Excise Act and
allegation is of recovery of 4 litres of liquor along with 3 pieces
of kingfisher beer from the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner was not arrested from the spot as such nothing was
recovered from his conscious possession and after 2018
amendment in the Excise Act, the concept of deemed possession
and presumed offender has been done away with. It is next



submitted that the house in question is a joint family property as such it cannot be alleged with certainty that it was petitioner who had kept the liquor or beer in the house or the liquor or beer kept in the house was within knowledge of the petitioner and he came to be implicated at the instance of Chowkidar but then it is submitted that if the Chowkidar was aware about the involvement of the petitioner 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. It is further submitted that once an accused is implicated in a case relating to excise, the police starts implicating mechanically either at the instance of Chowkidar, local person, confessional statement or secret information without holding a proper investigation.

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

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the petitioner above-named, in the event of his 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. 25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-five Thousand) 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 Harsidhi P.S. Case No. 398 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 petitioner and in the event if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of more than five cases then it would be presumed that petitioner, for the purposes of seeking anticipatory bail, had concealed his antecedent before this Court, as such, the provisional anticipatory bail order shall not be confirmed, but after verification if it is found that petitioner has antecedent of five cases, in that event the provisional anticipatory bail order shall be confirmed forthwith.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Sumit/-

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

