

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.75245 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2018 Thana- KALYANPUR District- Samastipur

Sanjeev Kumar Son Of Raj Kumar Sah Resident Of Village - Maniyarpur,
Ward No.- 7, P.O. And P.S.- Warisnagar, District - Samastipur (Bihar)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Priyesh Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Mritunjay Kumar Nirala

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

ORAL ORDER

2 07-12-2023 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within a period of three weeks from today.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 11 of 2018 dated 22.01.2018 for the offences punishable under Sections 414, 272 and 273 of the I.P.C. and Sections 30(a), 38, 38(i),(ii),(iii) and 47 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 509 litres of illicit liquor has been recovered from three different places.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated at para 3 of the bail petition. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out. The petitioner is owner of one of the motorcycle but the said motorcycle was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of occurrence. The other co-accused person has already been granted bail by the Co-ordinate Bench *vide* order dated 27.03.2018 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 17240 of 2018 .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.

6. 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.

7. 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, Samastipur in connection with Kalyanpur P.S. Case No. 11 of 2018, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

