

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.15998 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-1034 Year-2023 Thana- KANKARBAG District- Patna

Ayush Ranjan Son of Dilip Chaudhary Resident of Gola Road, Jhakhari
Mahadeo, P.S. Danapur, Dist.- Patna

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Siddharth Alok, Adv

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Mukesh Kumar Singh, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 12-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The Petitioners is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kankarbagh P.S. Case No. 1034 of 2023 dated 08.10.2023 of the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act 2018.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 33.120 litres of illicit country liquor was recovered from the *Mahindra XUV*.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioner transpired in this case only on the basis of the suspicion. The petitioner is



the owner of the said vehicle but the same was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged recovery. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out. 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



