

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.41779 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-14 Year-2024 Thana- GANGABRIDGE District- Vaishali

=====

Randhir Kumar S/o Ram Nath Ray @ Ram Nath Rai R/o Village-Rahar
Diyara, Ward No. 09, P.S.-Sonepur, District-Saran at Chapra (Owner of the
vehicle Splendor Plus Bearing Reg. No.- BR-04AP-3604

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sudha, Adv.

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

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 30-08-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in
connection with Ganga Bridge P.S. Case No. 14/2024 dated
20.01.2024 for the offences punishable u/s 420 of the IPC and
Sections 30(a) and 30(c) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise
Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, 100 litres of country-
made liquor, 225 empty bottles, 16.50 litres of Indian made
foreign liquor, plastic caps, 1088 pieces of sticker of imperial
blue and two motorcycles were recovered from the banana
orchard.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner is accused in four other criminal cases and he is on bail in all the aforesaid cases as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is the owner of one of the seized vehicles but he has no concern with the alleged recovery. 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 15.03.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 17492 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, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Ganga Bridge P.S. Case No. 14/2024, 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	
---	--	---	--

