

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47503 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-151 Year-2024 Thana- DHAKA District- East Champaran

Sachin Kumar Son of Upendra Ray Village- Bakhari Khajuri, Ps- Dhaka,
Dist- East Champaran Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Prateek Tandon, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-08-2024 Heard Mr. Prateek Tandon, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Syed Ehteshamuddin, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Dhaka P.S. Case No. 151 of 2024, F.I.R dated 13.04.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 411/34 of Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

3. Recovery is of 171 liters of Nepalese liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been implicated in the present case. He further submits that from the perusal of the F.I.R, it appears that nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner rather the recovery has been made from the motorcycle in question. He further submits that the petitioner is not the owner of the motorcycle in question and he has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of the illicit liquor or 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 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 that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has 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 the learned Exclusive Special Excise Court No.3, Civil Court, East Champaran, Motihari in connection with Dhaka P.S. Case No. 151 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 absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his 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 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)

priyanka/-

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

