

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.29257 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-301 Year-2020 Thana- GAIGHAT District- Muzaffarpur

Nikhil Thakur @ Nikhil Kumar S/o Lalan Thakur @ Prem Kumar Thakur R/o
village Ghosaut PS Siwaipatti District Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bela Singh

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Sharda Kumari

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

ORAL ORDER

2 05-07-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his/her arrest in a case in connection with Gaighat P.S. Case No. 301 of 2020, G.R. No. 1227/2020 dated 27.09.2020 for the offence/s punishable u/ss 272, 273, 414, 420, 467, 468, 471, 120B of the IPC and sections 30(a), 41, 56(b) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, one bottle of foreign liquor and 8000 litres of illicit spirit were recovered from the truck.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in



this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is neither the owner nor the driver of the said vehicle. The name of the petitioner has sprung up during the course of investigation. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. The petitioner has seven criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. Learned counsel has submitted that no case is made out against the petitioner. 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 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/her 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 Gaighat P.S. Case No. 301 of 2020, G.R. No. 1227/2020, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, with further condition/s:-

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned Court below on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the bail bond of the petitioner is liable to cancelled.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

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

