

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.57901 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-555 Year-2019 Thana- KANTI THARMAL
POWER District- Muzaffarpur

- =====
1. DINESH CHAUDHARY, aged about 61 years, male, Son of Baidhnath Chaudhary Resident of village- Demha Dullam, P.S.- Kanti, District- Muzaffarpur.
 2. Jyoti Chaudhary Son of Dinesh Chaudhary Resident of village- Demha Dullam, P.S.- Kanti, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioners

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioners : Mr. Manoj Kumar, Advocate.
For the Opposite Party: Mr. Renuka Ratnakar, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN
ORAL ORDER

2 13-09-2019 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
APP for the State.

2. The petitioners apprehend their 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 Kanti P.S. Case No. 555 of 2019.

3. It is submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in connection with recovery of 13.245 litres of liquor. It is submitted that no accusation whatsoever has been made in the F.I.R. in order to attract the offence alleged under the Prohibition Act, as it has merely been stated that incriminating goods were recovered from a bush behind the house of the



petitioner, without however connecting the place of recovery or the said goods to the petitioner in any manner whatsoever. 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 Judge, Excise, Muzaffarpur in connection with Kanti P.S. Case No. 555 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)

lbrar//-

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

