

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59268 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-140 Year-2022 Thana- PANAPUR District- Saran

=====

SURAJ MAHTO @ SURAJ KUMAR MAHTO SON OF MUNI MAHTO
Resident of Village- Methaura, P.S.- Panapur, District- Saran at Chapra

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jeetendra Narayan, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anil Kumar Singh No. 1, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

4 06-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise (Amendment) Act 2018.

Recovery is of 55 liters of country made liquor.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. The name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of the secret information and except secret information no cogent material has come during investigation against the petitioner. Further submits that the recovery has been made from the house of co-accused, namely, Muni Devi and not from petitioner's possession. Petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged



recovery of illicit liquor. Therefore, the recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioner. 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.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for 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. Further submits that the petitioner carries one more case other than the present one.

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) PLJR 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, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and his name has been transpired on the basis of the secret information, let the petitioner, above named, in the event of his 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) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned court below where the case is pending in connection with Panapur P.S. Case No. 140 of 2022, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other 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 their absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bonds shall be cancelled by the Court below.

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

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 antecedents, 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)

Nitesh/-

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

