

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51389 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-203 Year-2019 Thana- WAJIRGANJ District-
Gaya

=====

DEEPAK KUMAR, male, aged about 25 years, Son of Arjun Mishtri
Resident of Village - Babhandi, P.S.- Wazirganj, Dist.- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Ravindra Kumar Sinha, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party: Mr. Jitendra Kumar Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

2 20-08-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences alleged under Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016 (for short 'the Prohibition Act') registered in connection with Wazirganj P.S. Case No. 203 of 2019.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in connection with recovery of a total 6.375 litres of liquor. It is submitted that even on perusal of the F.I.R., no accusation has made out against the petitioner in order to attract the offence alleged under the Prohibition Act, as it has merely been stated that the recovery of the offending goods was made from a place east of the petitioner's welding shop, without however connecting the place of recovery or the said goods to the petitioner in any manner whatsoever. A specific statement has been made in paragraph-7 of the petition that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged place of occurrence. The petitioner



claims clean antecedents.

4. Ordinarily, an anticipatory bail petition in relation to the offence under the Prohibition Act is not maintainable. However, where, on the basis of the statements in the first information report, the ingredients of the offence alleged against a persons are not made out, as observed by a Division Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 21578 of 2017 (*Manish Kumar @ Lokesh Kumar Vs. The State of Bihar*) and analogous cases, there would be no bar to the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Learned APP has not pointed out any material in the F.I.R. alleging any offence to have been committed by the petitioner in order to attract the provisions of the said Prohibition Act.

6. Be that as it may, in the event of the petitioner's arrest or surrender before the court below within six weeks from the date of communication of this order, let the above named petitioner be released on bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (ten thousand) with two sureties of like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Special Excise Judge, Gaya in connection with Wazirganj P.S. Case No. 203 of 2019, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438 (2) Cr.P.C., and also subject to the following further conditions -

(i) That one of the bailors shall be a close relative of the petitioner.

(ii) That the petitioner shall not indulge in any similar offence till conclusion of the trial.

(iii) That the petitioner shall cooperate with the investigation, if not already concluded, and make himself available as and when so required and in case of failure, the State shall be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

(iv) That the petitioner shall remain physically present in Court on each and every date during trial, and in the event of



failure on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be liable to be cancelled by the learned Court concerned.

(Vikash Jain, J)

Ibrar//-

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

