

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81185 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-167 Year-2022 Thana- PRANPUR District- Katihar

=====

MD. RAMJAN ALI SON OF LATE ABDUL RAHMAN RESIDENT OF
VILLAGE - DUBALI, POLICE STATION - KASBA, DISTRICT - PURNEA

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

THE STATE OF BIHAR BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Akhauri Kamal Kishore Sahay, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Chandra Sen Prasad Singh, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 12-01-2024 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 a case in
connection with Pranpur (Roshna) P.S. Case No. 167 of 2022
dated 01.08.2022 for the offence/s punishable u/s 30(a) of the
Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 64.875 litres of
illicit foreign liquor was recovered from the Tempo.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted
that the petitioner 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 petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. The petitioner has already sold the said vehicle to one Mithun Sah prior to the alleged occurrence. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent 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.

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 material available on record, 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, Katihar in connection with Pranpur (Roshna) P.S. Case No. 167 of 2022, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

8. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

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

