

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16744 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-914 Year-2023 Thana- DIGHA District- Patna

-
1. Rishi Raj @ Rishi Mahto @ Rishi son of Mahesh Mahto R/o- Ramjichak Digha Bataganj Danapur Khagaul Patna
 2. Sunil Kumar son of Vijay Mahto R/o- Ramjichak Digha Bataganj Danapur Khagaul Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Virendra Kumar Ray

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Tiwary

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 14-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioners and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioners are apprehending their arrest in a case in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 914/2023 dated 26.11.2023 registered for the offences punishable u/ss 30(a), 32(2) (3), 36 and 41(1)(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 5076 litres of illicit foreign liquor was recovered from the truck which was parked inside the godown.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioners have no criminal



antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioners hence, no case is made out against the petitioners. The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R, the name of the petitioner has sprung up in the confessional statement of the co-accused, Sonu Kumar. The petitioner is neither the owner of the godown nor the owner of the seized truck. 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 petitioners 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 petitioners, let the above named petitioners, in the event of their



arrest/surrender within a period of six weeks from today, be enlarged on bail on furnishing bail-bond of Rs. 20,000/- (Rupees Twenty thousand) each with two sureties of the like amount each to the satisfaction of learned court concerned, Patna in connection with Digha P.S. Case No. 914/2023 subject to conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

7. This application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

