

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1220 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-491 Year-2022 Thana- JAYNAGAR District- Madhubani

Kripal Kumar Shah @ Kripal Shah son of Vinod Sah Resident of Village-
Bajitpur Chhipaliya, Milki, p.s- Bahadurpur District Darbhanga Bihar

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Alok Chaubey, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Parmanand Kumar, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 31-01-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in a case in connection with Jaynagar P.S. Case No. 491 of 2022 dated 07.12.2022 for the offence/s punishable u/ss 353 and 323 read with section 34 of the IPC and sections 37 and 45 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, during vehicle checking, police stopped one vehicle bearing Reg. No. DL3CCE9049 and the driver of the said vehicle misbehaved with the police personnel and managed to flee away but two persons in the same vehicle, who were in drunken condition were apprehended.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. No incriminating material has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner is not named in the FIR. The owner of the said vehicle disclosed the name of the petitioner. 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.

5. 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.

6. 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, Madhubani in connection with Jaynagar P.S. Case No. 491 of 2022, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

guddukr/-

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

