

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.26439 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2024 Thana- BENIPATTI District- Madhubani

Satto Mukhiya @ Satya Narayan Mukhiya SON OF KISHORI MUKHIYA @
KISHORI BINDE Village-Manpaur PS -Benipatti Distt -Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ratnakar Jha, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Bishweshwar Ram, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 16-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with G.R. No. 63/24 arising out of Benipatti P.S. Case No. 08 of 2024 dated 16.01.2024 for the offences punishable u/ss 272 and 273 of the Indian Penal Code and u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 36 litres of illicit Nepali liquor kept in a bag was recovered which was tied with a motorcycle.

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 was



disclosed by local people. 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. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. 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, Madhubani in connection with Benipatti P.S. Case No. 08 of 2024 corresponding to G.R. No. 63/24, 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	
---	--	---	--

