

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.69583 of 2022

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-181 Year-2022 Thana- TILAUTHU District- Rohtas

=====

BANTI YADAV @ OM PRAKASH SINGH S/O Late Suryavansh Yadav R/O
Village- Bhaluari, P.S- Indrapuri, District- Rohtas

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Mithilesh Kumar Singh, Advocate

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

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 25-02-2023 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.

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case

registered for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar

Prohibition and Excise Act.

As per the prosecution case, total 300 litres of Mahua

liquor kept in six sacks was recovered from a *Maruti Alto* car.

Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that

the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The

petitioner is neither the driver nor the owner of the said vehicle.



Nothing has been recovered from the possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. Learned counsel has submitted that 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 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.

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.

Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case as well as the material available on record, 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, Rohtas at Sasaram in



connection with Tilauthu P.S. Case No. 181 of 2022, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

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

