

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.40430 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-97 Year-2024 Thana- RAJAON District- Banka

=====

Anuj Kumar Manjhi Son of Umesh Prasad Manjhi Resident of Village -
Sitachak, P.O.- Motanga, P.S.- Dhouraia, District - Banka.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bijendra Kumar Singh , Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms.Pronoti Singh, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 10-07-2024 Heard Mr.Bijendra Kumar Singh , learned counsel

for the petitioner and Ms.Pronoti Singh, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Rajoun (Nabada) P.S.Case No.97 of 2024
(Spl.Ex.86/2024), FIR dated 18.02.2024 registered for the
offences punishable under Sections 30(a)of Bihar Prohibition
and Excise Act, 2018.

3. Recovery is of 15.375 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 merely on the ground that the



recovery has been made from the motorcycle in question and the petitioner is owner of the motorcycle in question. 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 petitioners 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 he has been made accused in the present case merely on the ground that he is owner of the motorcycle in question, 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 Addl. District and Sessions Judge-II, Banka in connection with Rajoun (Nabada) P.S.Case No.97 of 2024 (Spl.Ex.86/2024), 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	
---	--	---	--

