

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.47717 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-151 Year-2024 Thana- PARSA District- Saran

Vijay Nut S/o Jethu Nut, R/o Village- Shankar Dih, PS- Parsa, Dist- Saran.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Ms. Rajani Kumari, Advocate
For the Opposite Party : Ms. Pushpa Sinha.1, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 07-08-2024 Heard Ms. Rajani Kumari, the learned counsel for
the petitioner and Ms. Pushpa Sinha.1, the learned Additional
Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Parsa PS Case No. 151 of 2024, FIR dated
07.05.2024, registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 300 litres of country made liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has clean antecedent and he has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that according
to the FIR and seizure list, nothing has been recovered from the
conscious possession of the petitioner, rather the recovery has
been made from behind the house of the co-accused person



namely, Maina Devi. He further submits that name of the petitioner transpired on the basis of disclosure made by apprehended co-accused persons namely, Bhardul Nut, Dashee Nut and Putul Devi and except the aforesaid, no other cogent material has come during investigation which suggests the involvement of the petitioner in the present occurrence. 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 for the State on the other hand 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 and circumstances and mainly the facts that petitioner has clean antecedent, nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner and name of petitioner transpired on the basis of disclosure made by apprehended co-accused persons, let the petitioner, above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender before the learned trial Court 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/- (Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned 3rd Special Judge Excise-III, Saran at Chapra, where the case is pending in connection with **Parsa PS Case No. 151 of 2024**, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C. and also the following conditions:-

(i). Petitioner shall co-operate in the trial and shall be properly represented on each and every date fixed by the learned trial Court and shall remain physically present as directed by the learned trial Court and on his absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, his bail bond shall be cancelled by the learned trial Court.

(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 learned trial Court 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 learned trial Court shall take steps 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)

Shahnawaz/-

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

