

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4129 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-223 Year-2023 Thana- GANGABRIDGE District- Vaishali

Uday Rai Son Of Baleshwar Rai Resident Of Village - Diwan Tok, Ward No.
8, Gangabridge, District - Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shivjee Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Pushpa Sinha, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 12-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Gangabridge P.S. Case No. 223 of 2023 dated 08.10.2023 for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 110 litres of illicit country made liquor along with 5 Kg. nausadar tablet was recovered from the hut (*palani*) of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioner has



transpired in this case only on secret information. As per the F.I.R., the recovery has been made from the hut (palani) of the petitioner but as per the seizure list, the recovery has been made from the village Diwan Tonk which creates doubt upon the prosecution case. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence 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 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.

5. 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.

6. 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, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Ganga Bridge P.S. Case No. 223 of 2023, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Gautam/-

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

