

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.28208 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-207 Year-2021 Thana- GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP.
District- Vaishali

-
1. Mukul Kumar Son of Bhubneshwar Singh Resident of Village - Shahdullahpur, P.s.- Ganga Bridge, Distt.- Vaishali.
 2. Rajesh Kumar Son of Awadhesh Singh Resident of Village - Shahdullahpur, P.s.- Ganga Bridge, Distt.- Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjeet Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 14-12-2022 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 Sections 30(a),
32(a), 32(c), 41(a), 41(b) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise
(Amendment) Act, 2018.

Recovery is of total 405 liters of foreign liquor.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that
petitioners are innocent and they have falsely been implicated in
the present case. He further submits that the recovery has been



made from Banana plantation and not from petitioners possession. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioners. He further submits that the name of the petitioners have 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 Banana plantation. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioners under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

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 and he further submits that petitioners carries two criminal antecedent other than the present one.

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, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioners and the name of the petitioners have transpired on the basis of suspicion, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of his 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 C2A No. 207 of 2021, 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 tampers 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	
---	--	---	--

