

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Criminal Miscellaneous No.5832 of 2018

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -176 Year- 2017 Thana -TARAIYA District- SARAN

=====

Ankaj Kumar Singh @ Munmun Singh S/o Chandraketu Narayan Singh @
Chandraketu Narayan, R/o village- Aakuchak, P.S.- Taraiya, District-
Saran at Chapra.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

.... Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ajay Kr. Thakur, Adv.
Mr. Bikarmdeo Singh, Adv.
Mr. Bimlesh Kr. Pandey, Adv.
Mr. Devendra Narayan Singh
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Binod Kumar No.3, APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SHIVAJI PANDEY
ORAL ORDER

3 06-02-2018 All the cases have been placed on the issue of
maintainability of the applications in view of bar under Section
76(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

This Court has called upon the lawyers to satisfy this
Court that de hors to the fact mentioned in each case, whether the
petition under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. will be maintainable on
the basis of the statement made in the F.I.R..

It will be relevant to quote Section 76(2) of the
aforesaid Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016, which reads as
follows:-

*“76(2) Notwithstanding anything mentioned in
sub-section (1) above, nothing in Section*



360 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act 2 of 1974), Section 438 of Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 (Act 2 of 1974) and Probation of Offenders Act 1958 (20 of 1958) shall apply in relation to any case involving the arrest of any person on an accusation of having committed an offence under this Act.”

The issue of maintainability of anticipatory bail has been discussed and decided in two anticipatory bail applications with two conflicting views and, later on, this issue came for consideration before the Division Bench of this Court, and to draw final view, it will be appropriate to consider the views discussed in the aforesaid orders.

The first case with the issue of maintainability came for consideration in Cr. Misc. No. 26109 of 2017 wherein the Coordinate Bench of this Court has held that as there is a specific prohibition of entertaining anticipatory bail application as provided under Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act, the office was directed not to entertain the application in view of the bar stipulated therein. The issue of maintainability again came for consideration before another Bench in the case of Manish Kumar @ Lokesh Kumar Vs. State of Bihar (Cr. Misc. No. 21578 of 2017) wherein learned Single Judge has held that the Bar 76(2) of



the Prohibition Act is void but, for authoritative pronouncement, the Single Bench referred the matter to the Division Bench on two points firstly, whether Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act is void in view of non-compliance of the requirement of Article 254 of the Constitution of India and, secondly, whether the Registry can be restrained to entertain bail application in view of the order of Coordinate Bench dated 7.7.2017 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 26109 of 2017.

The case of Manish Kumar (supra) was considered by the Single Bench and the Division Bench, as per reference made by the Single Bench, the Division Bench has held that as the vires, validity and the repugnancy of the provision of Section 76(2) of the Act is subjudice before the Apex Court, in such circumstances, it will not be proper to go into the issue and decide the issue of repugnancy in view of non-compliance of the provision of Article 254 of the Constitution of India. So this issue with regard to voidness of Section 76(2) of the Excise Act has been left open but, the Court with regard to second issue of entertaining the application under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C., it has been held that the Registry does not have a jurisdiction to prohibit the registration of the application under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C., it is the Bench which will decide as to whether the case is made out



under the Prohibition Act or not and if the case is made out under the Prohibition Act, the bar of Section 76(2) of the Act will apply but, in a case, when the facts of case itself depict that no case is made out under the Prohibition Act, the power can be exercised under the 438 of the Cr.P.C. Thus, the fact of each case will decide the maintainability of the application under Section 438 Cr.P.C. and only because the Registry has registered the case will not ipso facto be treated to be maintainable but, it is the Bench, which will decide the maintainability and applicability of Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act.

In view of the above, this Court now proposes to consider all the cases on its merit and the maintainability of petition will be dependent on the fact of each case.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the State.

In this case, the petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Taraiya P.S. Case No. 176 of 2017 registered for offences under sections 30(a), 38, 41 of the Bihar Prohibition of Excise Act, 2016.

As per allegation made in the First Information Report, the police made a raid in the village Aakuchak where it was found that Ankaj Kumar Singh @ Munmun Singh at Bandh



near the temple, was selling the liquor in a carton but, seeing the police, he fled away from there and he was identified by the Chawkidar of the area.

In view of the statement made in the First Information Report, this Court is of the view that Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act, 2016 will apply in this case and thus, the present petition under Section 438 of the Cr.P.C. is not maintainable.

This application is, accordingly, dismissed.

If the petitioner surrenders, the court below, without being influenced by this order, will decide the prayer for bail of the petitioner on the same day of appearance of the petitioner.

(Shivaji Pandey, J)

Rishi/-

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

