

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48147 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-510 Year-2021 Thana- MINAPUR District- Muzaffarpur

1. Malti Devi W/o Tapeswar Ram R/o village- Bahadurpur, P.S.- Minapur (Panapur O.P.), District- Muzaffarpur
2. Sunil Ram S/o Tapeswar Ram @ Sonu R/o village- Bahadurpur, P.S.- Minapur (Panapur O.P.), District- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Alok Kumar Alok, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State in the Virtual Court proceeding.

Learned counsel for the petitioners is permitted to remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Sections 272, 273/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and the Excise Act.

Recovery is of 20 liters of country made liquor.

Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the



petitioners have clean antecedent and have falsely been implicated in the present case only on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused Pawan Kumar. He further submits that the recovery has been made from the car in question and from co-accused namely Pawan Kumar and not from petitioner's possession. He further submits that they have no concern at all with the alleged recovery or the car in question. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioners. There is non-compliance with mandatory procedure prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of Cr. P.C. 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.

This court is aware of the decision of the **Full Bench** in the case of **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, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioners, let the petitioners, above named, in the event of their arrest or surrender before the court below within a period of thirty days from the date of receipt of the order. be released on 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 Minapur PS. Case No. 510 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other 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 bonds 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)

Ibrar//-

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

