

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.67610 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-112 Year-2024 Thana- KINJAR District- Jehanabad

Hiramani Devi Wife of Ghamandi Nat R/O Vill.- Natwa Tandi, P.S.- Kinjar,
Dist.- Arwal

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Paras Nath, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Ms. Asha Devi, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 03-10-2024 Heard Mr. Paras Nath, learned counsel for the

petitioner and Ms. Asha Devi, learned Additional Public

Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending her arrest in
connection with Kinjar P.S. Case No. 112 of 2024, F.I.R dated
24.07.2024 registered for the offences punishable under Section
30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2018.

3. Recovery is of 14 liters of country made liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
the petitioner has clean antecedent and she has falsely been
implicated in the present case. He further submits that it appears
from the F.I.R as well as seizure list that nothing has been
recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner rather
the recovery has been made from the house of the petitioner. He



further submits that the petitioner is not the exclusive owner of the said house and without following the due procedure under Section 100 of the Cr.P.C., the seizure list has been prepared by the prosecution. 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 her 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 Special Judge Excise-II, Jehanabad in connection with Kinjar P.S. Case No. 112 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 her absence on two consecutive dates without sufficient reason, 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 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)

Vanisha/-

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

