

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-252 Year-2017 Thana- ATRI District- Gaya

Janakwa Devi @ Janak Devi Wife Of Late Rajdev Chaudhary @ Late Sahdev Chaudhary @ Late Rajdev Chaudhari Resident Of Village - Sahora, P.S. - Atri, District - Gaya

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Kumar Veerendra Narayan, A.P.P.

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE CHANDRA PRAKASH SINGH

ORAL ORDER

2 30-01-2024 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 Atri P.S Case No. 252 of 2017 dated 07.10.2017 for the offences punishable u/s 272 and 273 of the I.P.C. and 30(a)(d) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

4. As per the prosecution case, total 4 litres of illicit liquor and 75 litres of *jawa mahua* were recovered



from the well near the house of the co-accused Rajdev Chaudhari.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. It is further submitted that the recovery is made from a well which is an open place accessible to anyone. It is further submitted that the petitioner being the wife of the co-accused, Rajdev Chaudhari. 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, Gaya in connection with Atri P.S Case No. 252 of 2017, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Nilmani/-

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

