

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.54603 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-44 Year-2024 Thana- KANHHAULI District- Sitamarhi

Pramod Sahni Son of Ram Ekabal Sahni Resident of Vill- Hanuman Nagar,
Laxmipur, P.S.- Sahiyara, District- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Hans Lal Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Pramod Kumar Pandey, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 20-09-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in connection with Kanhauli P.S. Case No. 44 of 2024 dated 17.03.2024 for the offence/s punishable u/s 404 of the Indian Penal Code and Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 1344.96 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the Scorpio and motorcycles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. There is general and omnibus allegation against the petitioner. The apprehended co-accused disclosed the name of



the petitioner. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The co-accused has been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 02.06.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 42410 of 2024. 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, Sitamarhi in connection with Kanhauli P.S. Case No. 44 of 2024, 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)

shivam/-

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

