

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.78312 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-370 Year-2022 Thana- GARKHA District- Saran

=====

Ramesh Kumar Yadav @ Tuntun Yadav Son Of Rajendra Yadav Resident Of
Village- Kukurghati, Ps- Khanpar, Distt- Deoria, U.P.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Vyas Kumar Mishra
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rabindra Kumar

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 02-01-2024 Learned counsel for the petitioner is permitted to

remove the defect(s), as pointed out by the office, if any, within

a period of three weeks from today.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned

Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

3. The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in

connection with Garkha P.S Case No. 370 of 2022 dated

13.06.2022 for the offences punishable under Sections 279, 337,

338 and 427 of the I.P.C and Sections 30(a). 36 and 41 of the

Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 320.76 litres of

illicit liquor has been recovered from Tata Sumo Gold vehicle.

The apprehended person disclosed the name of the petitioner.



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated at 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 neither owner nor driver of the said vehicle. 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.

6. 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.

7. 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, Saran in connection with Garkha P.S. Case No. 370 of 2022, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

