

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69573 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-713 Year-2021 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

=====

PINTU MANJHI SON OF KISHUN MANJHI @ VISHUN MANJHI R/O
MOHALLA- NACH BAGICHA MUSHARI, RAMJI CHAK, P.O.-
BATAGANJ, P.S.- DIGHA, DISTRICT- PATNA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhananjay Kumar Tiwary, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Surendra Prasad Singh, APP

=====

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to

remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within

a period of three weeks from today.

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 u/s 30(A), 30(B), 37(i),

37(ii), 32(iii) and 41(i) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

As per the prosecution case, total 8 litres of country

made liquor was recovered from the house of the petitioner.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that

the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. Learned

counsel has further submitted that the seizure list indicates that



the said recovery was made from the *Nach Bagicha Mushahari* and the next page of the seizure list indicates that the said recovery was made from the house of the petitioner which are contradictory with each other. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. Learned counsel has submitted that no case is made out against the petitioner. Learned Counsel has relied on the judgment of Full Bench of Hon'ble Patna High Court in the case of **Ram Vinay Yadav vs. State of Bihar 2019 (2) PLJR 1089**. The Full Bench in the case of **Ram Vinay Yadav (supra)** has held that an application for anticipatory bail in a case arising out of Bihar Excise and Prohibition Act can be maintained, despite the bar under Section 76 (2) of the Act, if on the basis of allegation made in the FIR, no offence under the said provision is made out.

Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner by submitting that the bar of Section 76(2) of the Act applies in this case.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the material available on record, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a



period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned, Patna in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 713 of 2021 (Special case No. 7913 of 2021), subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

1. The court below shall verify the criminal antecedent of the petitioner and at any stage, if 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.

The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

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

