

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.20015 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-27 Year-2022 Thana- BIKRAMGANJ District- Rohtas

KUNDAN KUMAR SRIWASTAV S/O- MADAN LAL R/O- VILLAGE-
SHIVPUR, P.S.- BIKRAMGANJ, DIST.- ROHTAS.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR BIHAR, PATNA

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shashi Kant, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Anuj Kumar Shrivastava, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 29-03-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Bikramganj P.S. Case No. 27 of 2022 dated 15.01.2022 for the offences punishable u/ss 25(1-b)a/26/27/35 of the Arms Act and Section 37(c) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total one country made pistol and two live cartridges were recovered from the possession of the co-accused, Pursotam Mishra.

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 has sprung up in the confessional statement of the co-accused, Purushotam Mishra. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery rather the recovery has been made from the co-accused person. Nothing 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 material available on the 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, Rohtas in connection with Bikramganj P.S. Case No. 27 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)

Gautam/-

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

