

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No. 60598 of 2022**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-195 Year-2022 Thana- GOH District- Aurangabad

SANTOSH CHOUDHARY son of Gauri Chaudhary Resident of village-  
Deohara, P.S- Goh, District- Aurangabad (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shailesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Indu Kumari Srivastava, APP

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

3      07-12-2022                      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 Sections 30(a), 30(c) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Amendment Act, 2018.

Recovery is of 500 liters of Java Mahua kept in Drum and 05 liters of Mahua liquor.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has clean antecedent. He has falsely been implicated in the present case. Further submits that the name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of the name given by the local Spy. Further submits that the recovery has been made from the Narkatiya forest and not from petitioner's possession and the 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.

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, he has clean antecedent and his name has been transpired on the basis of the name given by the local Spy, 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 Goh P.S. Case No. 195 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 |  |
|---|--|---|--|

