

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38287 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-86 Year-2024 Thana- MANJHI District- Saran

RAJESH KUMAR CHAUDHARY @ RAJESH CHAUDHARY SON OF
LATE GOPAL CHAUDHARY RESIDENT OF VILLAGE - TAJPUR, P.S. -
MANJHI, DISTRICT - SARAN AT CHAPRA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Chandra Mohan Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 26-06-2024 Heard Mr. Chandra Mohan Jha, learned counsel for

the petitioner and Mr. Ajay Kumar No. 2, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest connection
with Manjhi P.S. Case No. 86 of 2024, F.I.R. dated 23.03.2024
registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of
the Bihar Prohibition & Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 50 liters of countrymade liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case merely on the basis of suspicion.
He further submits that from perusal of the F.I.R. as well as
seizure list that nothing has been recovered from the possession



of the petitioner rather recovery has been made from the backside house of the petitioner and the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of illicit liquor. 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.

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.

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, nothing has been recovered from conscious possession or the house of the



petitioner and the petitioner having 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 learned 2nd Exclusive Special Excise Judge, Saran at Chapra in connection with Manjhi PS. Case No. 86 of 2024, 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)

Ibrar//-

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

