

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.22547 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-442 Year-2022 Thana- TAJPUR District- Samastipur

=====

AJEET KUMAR @ AJIT KUMAR S/O UMESH RAY R/O VILLAGE-
LACHKA, P.S- TAJPUR, DISTT.- SAMASTIPUR.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Pushpa Sinha.1

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 04-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Tajpur P.S. Case No. 442 of 2022, dated 15.09.2022 for the offences punishable under Sections 30(a), 41(1), 41(2) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per prosecution case, total 454.710 litres of illicit foreign liquor has been recovered from the Ratnaha Chour, (open field).

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 4 of the supplementary affidavit filed on behalf of the



petitioner. Local villagers disclosed the name of the petitioner. Learned counsel further submitted that the recovery is made from the open field which is accessible to anyone. 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 APP 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, Samastipur in connection with Tajpur P.S. Case No. 442 of 2022, 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)

Ranjeet/-

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

