

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.68209 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-126 Year-2022 Thana- MEHANDIA District- Jehanabad

Mukesh Kumar Son of Parsuram Resident of Village- Bodh Bigha, P.S.-
Mehandiya, District- Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rama Kant Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sanjay Kumar Pandey, 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 Section 30(a) of
Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2018.

Recovery is of 400 gm of Mahua wine.

Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that the name
of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of the



confessional statement made by the co-accused persons, namely, Gajendra Kumar and Rajesh Kumar @ Rajesh Kumar Vidyarthi. He further submits that it is alleged in the F.I.R. that the petitioner has supplied the liquor in question to the co-accused persons. He further submits that the recovery has been made from the possession of the co-accused persons, namely, Gajendra Kumar and Rajesh Kumar @ Rajesh Kumar Vidyarthi and not from petitioner's possession. He further submits that the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of the illicit liquor or the co-accused persons. 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.

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.

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 his name has been transpired on the basis of the confessional statement of the co-accused persons and the petitioner has clean antecedent, 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 Mehandiya P.S. Case No. 126 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 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)

Vanisha/-

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

