

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.49732 of 2026

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-290 Year-2016 Thana- PIRO District- Bhojpur

Manoj Kumar Singh @ Manoj Kumar S/O Late Sitaram Singh Resident of
Village- Jorja, P.S.- Baheri, District- Darbhanga

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Shashi Kant, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Abhay Kumar, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SATYAVRAT VERMA
ORAL ORDER

2 28-07-2026 1. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and
learned A.P.P. for the State.

2. The petitioner apprehends his arrest in a case
registered for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 420
and 120B/34 of the Indian Penal Code as well as Section 7 of
the Essential Commodities Act.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that
petitioner has antecedent of one case and the informant alleges
that two trucks were apprehended carrying 220 quintals of rice
in 400 bags and the drivers, Uday and Ramesh, disclosed that
the trucks were loaded on 27.09.2016 from Karkagaon, Tarari
Godown with CMR rice to be carried to the PDS Godown,
Bihiya on orders of Assistant Godown Manager. The trucks
were apprehended because they were not having GPS which is
mandatory for carrying essential items. Further, the Assistant



Godown Manager came to the police station and corroborated the facts disclosed by the drivers but the trucks were seized as they were not GPS enabled.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that petitioner has been falsely implicated in the instant case being Pickup Incharge of the Godown. It is further submitted that petitioner is not named in the FIR and he came to be implicated during the course of investigation. It is next submitted that name of the petitioner transpired in the supervision report. It is also submitted that the truck may not be GPS enabled but then it is not the case of the prosecution that illegal rice was being transported. It is further submitted that till date investigation in the case against the petitioner is continuing. It is next submitted that if the privilege of anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner, the petitioner will not abscond rather will cooperate in the investigation to prove his innocence. It is also submitted that till date no process under Section 82 Cr.P.C. has been issued.

5. Learned A.P.P. for the State opposes the prayer for anticipatory bail of the petitioner.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner, let the petitioner,



above-named, in the event of his arrest or surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be released on anticipatory bail on furnishing bail bonds of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand) with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court where the case is pending/Successor Court in connection with Piro P.S. Case No. 290 of 2016, subject to the conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Cr.P.C./482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

(Satyavrat Verma, J)

Kundan/-

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

