

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.84046 of 2023

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-228 Year-2022 Thana- GANGABRIDGE District- Vaishali

Kundan Kumar, aged about 27 years (male), son of Dinesh Ray, resident of Village Kuwaribuzurg P.S. Ganga Bridge, District Vaishali.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Awadhesh Kumar Singh, Advocate.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Ram Naresh Ray, A.P.P.

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 Ganga Bridge P.S Case No. 228 of 2022 dated 12.09.2022 for the offences punishable u/ss 467, 468, 471, 420 and 34 of I.P.C. and 30(a), 36, 41(i) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 3681 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the truck, magic van and tractor.



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 neither the owner nor the driver of the said vehicles. The co-villagers disclosed the name of the petitioner. 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, Vaishali at Hajipur in connection with Ganga Bridge P.S Case No. 228 of 2022, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Nilmani/-

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

