

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24131 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-122 Year-2020 Thana- NADI P.S. District- Patna

Dharmendra Ray @ Dharmendra Kumar Son Of Bahadur Ray R/O Village-
Fatehjangpur, P.S.- Nadi, District- Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

with

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24541 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-122 Year-2020 Thana- NADI P.S. District- Patna

BIRENDRA RAY Son of Jay Ram Ray Resident of Village - Fatehjangpur,
P.S.- Nadi, District - Patna.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24131 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jay Ram Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, A.P.P.

(In CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 24541 of 2022)

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Jay Ram Prasad, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Anurag Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 29-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

Let the defects, as pointed out by the office, be
removed within a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioners apprehend their arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of
Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act, 2018.

Recovery is of total 1860 liters of country made wine.



Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners have clean antecedent and they have falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that the recovery has been made from the Boat in question and not from petitioners possession. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioners. He further submits that the name of the petitioners have been transpired on the basis of suspicion and except the suspicion no cogent material has come during investigation against the petitioners. He further submits that petitioners have no concern at all with the alleged recovery of illicit liquor or the boat in question. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioners under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act. He further submits that similarly situated co-accused persons namely, Uday Rai, Ranjeet Rai and Kallu Ahmad have been granted anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 20.05.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. NO. 70121 of 2021.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioners referring the provision contained in Section 76(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act and submitted that the pre-arrest bail would not be maintainable.



This court is aware of the decision of the Full Bench in the case or **Ram Vinay Yadav Vs. State of Bihar** reported in **2019(2) P.L.J.R. 1089**. Having regard to the law laid down in the aforesaid judgment and the submission advanced on behalf of the parties, this Court, for the limited purpose of grant of anticipatory bail, is inclined to accept the submission of counsel for the petitioners.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, petitioners have clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioners and the name of the petitioners have been transpired on the basis of suspicion, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender within a period of four weeks from the date of receipt of the order, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs. 10,000/- (Ten Thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Special Case No. 4595 of 2020 arising out of Nadi P.S. Case No. 122 of 2020, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-

1. Petitioners shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every



date fixed by the court and shall remain physically present as directed by the court and on their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, their bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

2. If the petitioners tamper with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of bail.

3. And further condition that the court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioners and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioners have concealed their criminal antecedent, the court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioners. 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.

(Rajesh Kumar Verma, J)

mdrashid/-

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

