

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.70430 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-269 Year-2023 Thana- KARJA District- Muzaffarpur

Ranjan Kumar Son Of Mahesh Ray Resident Of Village - Naya Tola, Narhar
Sarai, P.S. - Karja, District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Yugal Kishore, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Shantanu Kumar, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 01-11-2023 Heard Mr. Yugal Kishore, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr. Shantanu Kumar, learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Karja P.S. Case No. 269 of 2023, F.I.R dated
11.08.2023 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 7.200 liters of foreign liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in the
present case on the basis of disclosure made by the co-accused
person, namely, Ajay Rai. He further submits that it appears
from the F.I.R that nothing has been recovered from the
conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has



been made near Ganaura Inda Naurang Sahpur which is an open place. He further submits that the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of the illicit liquor or the co-accused person and except the disclosure made by the co-accused, no other material has come during investigation to suggest the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence. 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.

5. 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 one criminal antecedent of similar nature but fairly submits on the basis of paragraph 3 of the bail petition that the petitioner is on bail in the pending case.

6. 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.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts, 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 Exclusive Special Judge Excise, Court No. II, Muzaffarpur in connection with Karja P.S. Case No. 269 of 2023, 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	
---	--	---	--

