

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.8707 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-329 Year-2023 Thana- MURLIGANJ District- Madhepura

Sunil Singh @ Sunil Kumar Singh S/O Nageshwar Singh Village- Rajni, Ps.
Murliganj, Dist. Madhepura.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Ranjay Kumar Singh, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mohammad Sufyan, APP.

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

ORAL ORDER

2 22-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 329 of 2023 dated 12.08.2023 for the offence punishable u/s 30(a), 32(ii)(iii), 41(i) (ii) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 3792 litres of foreign liquor was recovered from a truck and a Pick-Up van.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is neither the owner nor the driver of the said vehicle. The said vehicle



was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. The name of the petitioner has transpired in the confessional statement of the co-accused namely, Shiv Kumar and Sintu Mahto. Similarly situated co-accused, Pranav Kumar has been granted anticipatory bail vide order dated 16.02.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 5572 of 2024 by this Court. 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.

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 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, Madhepura in connection with Murliganj P.S. Case No. 329 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)

annpurna/-

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

