

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.48600 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-350 Year-2021 Thana- GAIGHAT District- Muzaffarpur

Reena Devi Wife of Rambabu Sahni @ Ramvavu Sahni Resident of Village -
Sakarwara Noor, P.S.- Gaighat, District - Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Shekhar Anand, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Suresh Prasad Singh, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 18-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner 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 petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 272, 273,
353, 427/34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of Bihar
Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act, 2016.

Recovery is of total 05 liters of country made wine
and 15 liters of jiggery Mahua mixed liquid from the house of
the co-accused Saroj Sahni.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that the



recovery has been made from the house of the co-accused Saroj Sahni and not from petitioner's possession. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that the name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused namely, Saroj Sahni. No case, whatsoever, would be made out against the petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

The learned Additional Public Prosecutor has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner 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 petitioner.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner, let the petitioner, 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) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Gaighat P.S. Case No. 350 of 2021, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-

1. Petitioner 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 his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

2. If the petitioner 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 petitioner and in case at any stage it is found that the petitioner has concealed his criminal antecedent, the



court below shall take step for cancellation of bail bond of the petitioner. 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	
---	--	---	--

