

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.38640 of 2019**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-156 Year-2019 Thana- BODHGAYA District-
Gaya

=====

ISHWAR CHAUDHARY, aged about 40 years, male, Son of Krishna
Choudhary Resident of Village- Khairabara, P.S.- Bodhgaya, District- Gaya.

... .. Petitioner

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner : Mr. Kamal Kumar Sinha, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party: APP

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE VIKASH JAIN

ORAL ORDER

2 01-07-2019

The petitioner apprehends his arrest for the offences alleged under Sections 272, 273 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Amendment Act, 2016 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Prohibition Act, 2016') registered in connection with Bodh Gaya P.S. Case No. 156 of 2019.

2. At the very outset, this Court takes note of an order passed by a co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Ashok Sahani Vs. The State of Bihar, 2017(3) PLJR 632. After a detailed deliberation over the effect of Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act, 2016, it was categorically opined in paragraph-14 that the privilege of pre-arrest bail under Section 438 of the Cr. P.C. is not available to person accused of having committed an offence under the Prohibition Act, 2016. Certain guidelines (not exhaustive) were also laid out in paragraph-30, indicating circumstances where bail should normally be granted to the accused persons on their production by the police or on their surrender. The Registrar General was also directed to ensure that



stamp reporters would not place applications filed under Section 438 of the Cr. P.C. arising out of the cases under the Prohibition, Act, 2016 before the Bench as defect free cases henceforth.

3. The aforesaid order in Ashok Sahani's case (supra) came to be considered of another co-ordinate Bench of this Court passed in Cr. Misc. No. 21578 of 2017 (Manish Kumar @ Lokesh Kumar Vs. The State of Bihar) which, by order dated 10.08.2017, held the earlier judgment per incuriam, apart from holding the provisions of Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act, 2016 as void in view of Article 254 of the Constitution of India. The question whether the Registry could be restrained from entertaining anticipatory bail petitions as directed in Ashok Sahani's case (supra), was referred to a larger Bench.

4. By another judgment dated 03.10.2017 passed by a third co-ordinate Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 42985 of 2017 (Barun Kumar Vs. The State of Bihar), the issue relating to maintainability of anticipatory bail petitions in respect of offences under the Prohibition Act, 2016 came to be considered yet again. The decision in Manish Kumar's case (supra) was found to have been passed in oversight of the relevant provisions of the Constitution of India as well as Section 4 of the Cr. P.C. which could not be placed before it. As such the decision in Ashok Sahani's case (supra) was held to be binding on a co-ordinate Bench wherein it had been held that an anticipatory bail petition under Section 438 of the Cr. P.C. cannot be maintained in cases of offences arising out of the Prohibition Act, 2016.

5. The reference to the Larger Bench in Cr. Misc. No. 21578 of 2017 (Manish Kumar @ Lokesh Kumar Vs. The State of Bihar) was answered by the Division Bench in its order dated 06.11.2017 since reported in 2017(4) BLJ PHC-288, opining that the Registry could not be restrained from entertaining anticipatory bail petition in compliance of the order passed in



Ashok Sahani's case (supra). However, in paragraph-9 of the said order, it was specifically stated that the aspect of the vires/validity/repugnancy of Section 76(2) was not being considered as the same was already sub-judice before the Apex Court. The principles noticed by an earlier Division Bench in Bisheshwar Mishra Vs. The State of Bihar, 2016 (4) PLJR 1058 in the context of a similar bar to grant of anticipatory bail under the provisions of SC/ST Act in the light of the Apex Court's decision in Vilas Pandurang Pawar Vs. State of Maharashtra, (2012) 8 SCC 795 were taken note of in paragraph-13, which cast a duty upon the Court considering the pre-arrest bail of an accused, to look into the allegations made in the F.I.R./complaint to find out whether ingredients of the offence under the SC/ST Act were prima facie made out or not before exercising its judicial discretion under Section 438 of the Cr. P.C. It was therefore held that the law regarding consideration of an application under Section 438 of the Cr. P.C. for grant of pre-arrest bail to the accused under an Act where there is a bar to grant of anticipatory bail, had been settled as such.

6. In a recent development, an order dated 19.12.2018 was passed by a Single Bench of this Court in Cr. Misc. No. 69522 of 2018 (Suresh Singh and Anr. vs. State of Bihar) rejecting the prayer for anticipatory bail as not maintainable in view of Section 76(2) of the Prohibition Act, 2016. The said order was assailed before the Hon'ble Supreme Court giving rise to Special Leave to Appeal (Criminal) No. 2581 of 2019 which came to be disposed of on 26.03.2019, inter alia, with the following observations--

"We are not inclined to interfere with this Special Leave Petition.

The Special Leave Petition is dismissed with liberty to the petitioner to pursue remedy of regular bail, if so advised. The



same be filed within two weeks' from today."

7. No material change on the question of maintainability appears to have come about also as a result of the recent judgment dated 17.05.2019 of a Full Bench of this Court in Cr. Appeal (SJ) No. 431 of 2019 (Ram Vinay Yadav vs. The State of Bihar).

8. From the F.I.R., it *prima facie* appears that accusations have been made which would constitute an offence under the Prohibition Act as concerns the petitioner.

9. In view of the above, this Court has no hesitation in holding that the anticipatory bail petition in respect of offences alleged against the petitioner under the Prohibition Act, 2016 is not maintainable.

10. A prayer for adjournment was made on behalf of the petitioner when the matter was called. However, this Court is of the view that no fruitful purpose will be served in adjourning the matter inasmuch as the petition itself has been held to be not maintainable as above.

11. The anticipatory bail petition accordingly stands dismissed.

(Vikash Jain, J)

lbrar//-

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

