

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.58373 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-67 Year-2022 Thana- TATARPUR District- Bhagalpur

1. PRADEEP MANDAL @ PRADEEP KUMAR MANDAL Son of Hira Lal Mandal Resident of Village - Hariyari, P.S.- Poriyahat, District - Godda (Jharkhand)
2. Rohit Bhagat @ Rohit Kumar Bhagat Son of Dharmdeo Bhagat Resident of Village - Hariyari, P.S.- Poriyahat, District - Godda (Jharkhand)
3. Sanjay Mandal Son of Ajay Mandal Resident of Village - Hariyari, P.S.- Poriyahat, District - Godda (Jharkhand)
4. Satish Choudhary Son of Vinod Choudhry Resident of Village - Hariyari, P.S.- Poriyahat, District - Godda (Jharkhand)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rajive Ranjan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Nand Kishore Prasad

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL ORDER

2 02-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and
learned APP for the State.

Learned counsel for the petitioners undertakes to remove the defects within three weeks. In the eventuality of non-removal of defects within undertaken period, the office will place the matter before the Bench.

, The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case registered for the offence punishable under Section 272, 273, 302, 328 and 34 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(I) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.



Learned counsel for the petitioners submits that petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that allegation against the petitioners is that one person died and one other person got serious health illness due to cheap and spurious liquor. He submits that petitioners are made accused on the basis of the confessional statement of the co-accused. He further submits that petitioners have got three criminal antecedents as stated in para-3 of the bail application.

Learned APP for the State opposes the bail application and submits that the petitioners are the manufacturers of the said illicit liquor. Hence, she does not deserve anticipatory bail.

Considering the facts and circumstance of the case and the fact that petitioners are the manufacturers of the illicit liquor, I am not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in connection with Tetarpur P.S. Case No. 67 of 2022.

Accordingly, her prayer for anticipatory bail is hereby rejected.

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

ajay/-

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

