

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.5413 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-232 Year-2020 Thana- GAYA MUFASIL District- Gaya

Yogendra Manjhi @ Yogindra Manjhi @ Yugendra Manjhi S/O Saman
Manjhi @ Samman Manjhi R/O Village Gere Bhuintoli, P.S.-Muffasil,
District-Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vinod Kumar, Adv.

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

**CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH
SINGH**

ORAL ORDER

2 16-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 232 of 2020 dated 24.06.2020 for the offences punishable u/ss 2(e), 3, 5, 13 Bihar Mahua Flower Act and u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 680 Kg. *mahua* flower was recovered from the hut adjacent to the house of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents in which



he is on bail as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioner has transpired in this case merely on suspicion. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out against the petitioner. Learned Counsel has relied on the judgment of Full Bench of Hon'ble Patna High Court in the case of **Ram Vinay Yadav vs. State of Bihar reported in 2019 (2) PLJR 1089**. The Full Bench in the case of **Ram Vinay Yadav (supra)** has held that an application for anticipatory bail in a case arising out of Bihar Excise and Prohibition Act can be maintained, despite the bar under Section 76 (2) of the Act, if on the basis of allegation made in the FIR, no offence under the said provision is made out.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State has vehemently opposed the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner by submitting that the bar of Section 76(2) of the Act applies in this case.

6. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the nature of allegation against the petitioner, let the above named petitioner, in the event of his arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be



enlarged on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees twenty thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned court concerned, Gaya in connection with Muffasil P.S. Case No. 232 of 2020, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure with further condition :-

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned Court below on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the prosecution will be at liberty to move for cancellation of his bail bond.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Gautam/-

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

