

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1811 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-279 Year-2023 Thana- MAJORGANJ District- Sitamarhi

Krishna Nandan Sahni S/O Chhedi Sahni R/O Village- Balua, P.S- Riga,
Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/S

Versus

The State Of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashok Kumar Jha, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE RAJESH KUMAR VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 31-01-2024 Heard Mr.Ashok Kumar Jha, learned counsel
appearing for the petitioner and Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma,
learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Majorganj P.S.Case No.279 of 2023,FIR dated 24.09.2023 registered for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. Recovery is of 54 liters of Nepali Saufi liquor.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in the present case on the basis of the disclosure made by the local villagers. Further submits that nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner and the petitioner has no concern at all with the alleged recovery of 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 petitioners under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State, on the other hand, 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. Further submits that the petitioner carries three more cases other than the present one but fairly submits that the petitioner is on bail in all the cases, as mentioned in para-3 of the anticipatory bail petition.

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 and nothing has been recovered from conscious possession of the petitioner, 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 Exclusive Special Judge, Excise Court No.1, Sitamarhi in connection with Majorganj P.S.Case No.279 of 2023, 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	
---	--	---	--

