

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35994 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-18 Year-2024 Thana- KARJA District- Muzaffarpur

Dhiraj Kumar @ Dheeraj Kumar S/o- Dilip Kumar Village- Rashulpur Ps-
Karja Dist- Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Nitu Kumari, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Shyameshwar Dayal, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 10-05-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Karja P.S. Case No. 18 of 2024 dated 16.01.2024 of the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act 2016.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 27 litres of illicit foreign liquor was recovered from the house of the co-accused *Birendra Singh*.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioner has



transpired in this case only on the basis of suspicion. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out. The co-accused person has already been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 18.04.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 27185 of 2024. 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, Muzaffarpur, in connection with Karja P.S. Case No. 18 of 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)

Gautam/-

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

