

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.55552 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-208 Year-2022 Thana- PATEPUR District- Vaishali

=====

SANJAY KUMAR @ SANJAY RAI SON OF UMESH RAI Resident of
Village- Ladaho, P.S.- Baligaon, District- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Bela Singh, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pronoti Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 25-11-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the
learned A.P.P. for the State.

The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offence under Section 30(a), 32(ii), 38(ii),
41(i) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

Recovery is of 1057.32 liters of foreign liquor.

Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner
submits that the petitioner, who is of clean antecedent, is
innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. He
further submits that the recovery has been made from
vehicle in question and, in fact, nothing has been recovered
from the conscious possession of the petitioner. He further
submits that neither the petitioner happens to be owner nor



he is the driver of the alleged vehicle. He further submits that the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery and the vehicle. Therefore, the alleged recovery cannot be attributed to the petitioner. He further submits that there is non-compliance with mandatory procedures prescribed for recovery under Section 100 of the Cr.P.C. No case, whatsoever alleged in the F.I.R., is made out against the petitioner under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act. Hence, the petitioner may be granted the privilege of anticipatory bail.

The learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner and referring to the provision contained in Section 76(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, he submits that pre-arrest bail is not maintainable.

This Court is aware of the decision of the Full Bench rendered 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 facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, let the, above named, petitioner in the event of arrest of surrender before the court below within a period of four weeks from the date of 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 Patepur P.S. Case No. 208 of 2022, subject to the conditions laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. as also with 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/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be canceled 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.

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)

brajesh/-

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

