

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51303 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2019 Thana- MAGADH MEDICAL COLLEGE
District- Gaya

=====

Munni Devi W/o Late Vijay Manjhi Resident of Village- Kendui, Bhui Toli,
P.S.- Magadh Medical, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Gajendra Kumar Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER**

2 21-11-2022 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 Section 30(a) of
Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

Recovery is of total 05 liters of country made liquor.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has clean antecedent and she has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that the
recovery has been made from joint house of the petitioner and
husband of the petitioner namely, Vijay Manjhi also made an



accused in the present occurrence. He further submits that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and she is lady and she has no concern with the alleged occurrence. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that 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 petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act. He further submits that similarly situated co-accused namely, Bauna Manjhi @ Jitendra Manjhi and Pramod Manjhi have been granted anticipatory bail by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court vide order dated 23.04.2019 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 26153 of 2019 and the case of the petitioner is similar footing.

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 Magadh Medical P.S. Case No. 44 of 2019, 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	
---	--	---	--

