

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.73782 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-211 Year-2023 Thana- ISUAPUR District- Saran

Sunil Rai @ Sunil Kumar Ray Son Of Ramnath Ray Resident Of Village-
Chakahan, Police Station- Isuapur, District- Saran

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Nitya Nand Tiwary, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 09-11-2023 Heard Dr. Rajesh Kumar Singh, learned counsel for
the petitioner as well as Mr. Nitya Nand Tiwary, learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Isuapur P.S. Case No.211 of 2023, F.I.R. dated
03.08.2023 registered for the offence punishable under Sections
272, 273 of the IPC and Section 30(a)/38/41 of the Bihar
Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

3. Allegation against the petitioner is of recovery of
450 litres spirit countrymade liquor from the tractor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case merely
on the basis of suspicion. He further submits that that nothing
has been recovered from the conscious possession of the
petitioner, rather recovery has been made from the tractor in



question and the petitioner is neither the owner nor the driver of the vehicle in question and and petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery or liquor, he has made accused on the basis of his previous criminal antecedent. 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. Further submits that petitioner carries two criminal antecedents other than the present one, but fairly submits that petitioner is on bail in both the pending cases.

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 anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bond of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned Third Exclusive Special Excise Judge, Saran at Chapra in connection with Isuapur P.S. Case No.211 of 2023, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure and with other following conditions:-

(i) 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 bonds shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(ii) If the petitioner tamper with the evidence or the witnesses, in that case, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of anticipatory bail.

(iii) 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 antecedents, the court below shall take step for cancellation of anticipatory 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)

Prakash Narayan

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

