

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1665 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-130 Year-2023 Thana- CHAINPUR District- Kaimur (Bhabua)

Hriday Ram @ Hriday Kumar son of Rajnath Ram R/o Village-Kanta, PS-
Saiyadraja, Dist-Chandauli (U.P)

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Abhash, Adv.

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

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

ORAL ORDER

2 01-02-2024 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Chainpur P.S. Case No. 130 of 2023 dated 20.05.2023 for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 356.04 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from a Bolero car which was driven by the co-accused, Kishasn Yadav who disclosed the name of the petitioner and the other co-accused persons.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in



para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioner was disclosed by the co-accused person. The petitioner is neither the owner nor the driver of the said vehicle and the same was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged recovery. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence 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 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.

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 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, Kaimur at Bhabua in connection with Chainpur P.S. Case No. 130 of 2023, 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)

Gautam/-

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

