

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.27506 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-11 Year-2024 Thana- DEODHA District- Madhubani

Lalu Ram Son of Satendra Ram @ Satendra Mahara Resident of Village-
Kamlabari Purv tol, Belhi, P.S.- Jaynagar, Dist.- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhavesh Sah

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Parmanand Kumar

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

ORAL ORDER

2 18-04-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Deodha P.S. Case No. 11/2024 arising out of G.R. No. 141/2024 dated 09.02.2024 for the offences punishable u/ss 272, 273 and 414 read with 34 of the IPC and Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 14.7 litres of illicit Nepali liquor was recovered from the scooty of the petitioner.

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. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out. The petitioner is the owner of the said vehicle but the said vehicle was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged occurrence. 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 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, Madhubani in connection with Deodha P.S. Case No. 11/2024 arising out of G.R. No. 141/2024, 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	
---	--	---	--

