

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.16270 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-536 Year-2017 Thana- BARACHATTI District- Gaya

-
1. Sunita Devi Wife of Umesh Chaudhary Resident of Village- Jaigir, P.S.- Barachatty, Distt.- Gaya
 2. Radhiya Devi Wife of Kamlesh Chaudhary Resident of Village- Anjaniya Tand, P.S.- Barachatty, Distt.- Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Vijay Kumar, Advocate

For the Opposite Party/s : Mrs. Sharda Kumari, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 13-03-2024 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 Barachatty P.S. Case No. 536/2017 dated 01.09.2017 registered for the offences punishable u/ss 30(a), 38 and 47 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 10 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from a tempo.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioners are neither the owner nor the driver of the said vehicle. The name of the petitioners have



transpired in this case on the basis of confession made by the co-accused, Malti Devi. 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. 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, Gaya in connection with Barachatty P.S. Case No. 536/2017, 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	
---	--	---	--

