

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.59902 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-291 Year-2024 Thana- RAJAOLI District- Nawada

Raju Chaudhary @ Ram Kumar S/o Late Charkhi Chaudhary @ Dinesh
Choudhary R/o Village- Par Rajauli, P.S.- Rajauli, Dist.- Nawada

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Deepak Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 11-09-2024 Heard Mr. Deepak Kumar, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Mr. Ram Bilash Roy Raman, learned Additional

Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Rajauli P.S. Case No. 291 of 2024, F.I.R dated
15.06.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 10 liters of country made Mahua
liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has clean antecedent and has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that it appears
from the F.I.R that 10 liters of Mahua liquor has been recovered
near the house of the petitioner. He further submits that the



name of the petitioner has been transpired on the basis of suspicion and except the suspicion, no other cogent material has come during investigation which suggest 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 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 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-2, Nawada in connection with Rajauli P.S. Case No. 291 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)

Vanisha/-

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

