

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.24365 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-710 Year-2023 Thana- BARHARA District- Bhojpur

1. Muskan Singh Son Of Tejan Singh Resident Of Village- Paiga, Ps- Barahara, Dist- Bhojpur
2. Tunu Ray @ Tuntun Ray Son Of Bhuteli Yadav @ Birendar Ray @ Bhuteli Ray @ Bhutan Bhuteli Ray Resident Of Village- Paiga, Ps- Barahara, Dist- Bhojpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Shiv Prasad Gupta, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Parmanand Prasad, APP

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 09-04-2024 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 Barahara P.S. Case No. 710 of 2023 dated 18.12.2023 registered for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 280 litres of illicit country made liquor was recovered from the Orchard of the petitioners.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioners has submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner no. 1 has no criminal



antecedent whereas the petitioner no. 2 has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioners has transpired in this case merely on suspicion. The petitioners have no concern with the alleged recovery rather the recovery has been made from an open place which is accessible to anyone. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioners, 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 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 material available on the record, 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, Bhojpur at Ara in connection with Barahara P.S. Case No. 710 of 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)

Gautam/-

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

