

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35371 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-30 Year-2024 Thana- BOCHAHAN District- Muzaffarpur

Uma Paswan @ Umanand Paswan Son of late Kapaldev Paswan R/O Vill.-
Karanpur Tola, Kakrachak, P.S.- Bochaha, Dist.- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Dr. Bipin Chandra, Advocate

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

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

3 31-07-2024 Heard Mr.Dr. Bipin Chandra, learned counsel for
the petitioner and Mr.Suresh Prasad Singh,learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Bochaha P.S.Case No.30 of 2024,FIR dated
01.02.2024 registered for the offences punishable under
Sections 272,273 of IPC and Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition
and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 446.760 liters of illicit foreign
liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. Learned counsel for the petitioner
further submits that the allegation as alleged in the FIR is false



and fabricated and the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged in the FIR and from a bare perusal of the FIR it appears that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the house of 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.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for 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.

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) PLJR 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, petitioner has clean antecedent and it appears from the FIR that nothing has been



recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner, 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 learned Exclusive Special Judge Excise, Court No.-III, Muzaffarpur in connection with Bochaha P.S.Case No.30 of 2024,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/her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his/her bail bond shall be cancelled by the Court below.

(II) 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.

(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/her 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)

Nitesh/-

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

