

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.83288 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-388 Year-2021 Thana- GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP.
District- Nawada

=====

Pinki Devi W/O Baru Kumar Yadav R/O Village- Mahuli, P.S- Haweli
Kharagpur, Distt.- Munger.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Sanjeev Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 19-01-2024 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 G.O Case No. 388/2021 dated 16.07.2021 for

the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and

Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 432 litres of illicit

liquor was recovered from the pick-up van which was being

driven by the co-accused Santosh Kumar.

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. The petitioner is a lady. No incriminating article has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out. The petitioner is the owner of the said vehicle but as per the annexure-P2, the petitioner prior to the said occurrence had sold the said vehicle on 17.01.2020 in favour of Chunchun Yadav. 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, Nawada in connection with G.O. Case No. 388 of 2021, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

