

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.82485 of 2023**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-79 Year-2023 Thana- MANIHARI District- Katihar

Aditya Kumar, Age-24 years, Male, Son of Amrendra Kumar Mallik @  
Amrendra Kumar Millak R/O Dilarur, P.S.- Manihari, District- Katihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar.

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

|                            |                                    |
|----------------------------|------------------------------------|
| For the Petitioner/s :     | Mr. Sanjeev Kumar Singh, Advocate. |
| For the Opposite Party/s : | Mr. Umanath Mishra, A.P.P.         |
|                            | Ms. Sharda Kumari, A.P.P.          |

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

ORAL ORDER

2      15-01-2024              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 Manihari P.S Case No. 79 of 2023 dated 20.04.2023 for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 12 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the E-Rickshaw (TOTO Rickshaw).



5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the petitioner is the owner of the said E.Rickshaw but the said E.Rickshaw was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of alleged occurrence. 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. 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, Katihar in connection with Manihari P.S Case No. 79 of 2023, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

**(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)**

Nilmani/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

