

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67018 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-339 Year-2022 Thana- BODHGAYA District- Gaya

=====

Santosh Kumar S/O Brijnandan Singh Resident Of Village- Gewal Bigha,
Munni Masjid, Baulipar, P.S.- Civil Line, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Lalan Kumar, A.P.P.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-12-2022 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State in the virtual court

proceeding.

Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to
remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within
a period of four weeks from today.

The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 467, 468,
470 and 120(B) of I.P.C. and Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition
and the Excise Act, 2016.

Recovery is of total of 4077 liters of English liquor.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case. He
further submits that the recovery has been made from vehicle in



question and not from petitioner's conscious possession. He further submits that the vehicle was standing in the godown of Ajay Kumar. He further submits that the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery or vehicle in question. He further submits that the name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused namely, Sudeep Kumar. 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. He further submits that the co-accused namely, Dinesh Kumar alias Dinesh has been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 17.11.2022 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 55489 of 2022.

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. He further submits that the petitioner carries three more cases 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) 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, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the name of the petitioner has transpired on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused namely, Sudeep Kumar, 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 the learned Court below where the case is pending in connection with Bodhgaya P.S. Case No. 339 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 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 state 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)

nilmani/-

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

