

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1236 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-175 Year-2020 Thana- KHANPURA District- Samastipur

Pradeep Kumar Son of Arjun Mahto resident of village khanpur, p.s.-
Khanpur, District- Samastipur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar BIHAR

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Rambabu Yadav, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Tapeshwar Sharma, 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 Khanpur P.S. Case No. 175 of 2020 dated
19.09.2020 for the offence/s punishable u/ss 30(a), 41(i), (ii) and
47 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 1860.120 litres of
illicit foreign liquor was recovered from the truck.

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 neither
the owner nor the driver of the said truck. The petitioner has no



concern with the alleged recovery. The name of the petitioner has transpired during the course of the investigation. The petitioner has three criminal antecedents as stated in para 2 of the supplementary affidavit filed on behalf of the petitioner. 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,
Samastipur in connection with Khanpur P.S. Case No. 175 of
2020, 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	
---	--	---	--

