

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA**  
**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.4537 of 2024**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-248 Year-2023 Thana- GANGABRIDGE District- Vaishali

Satyendra Rai S/o Raj Ballabh Rai R/o Vill- Diwantok, PS- Ganga Bridge,  
Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Patna, Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

**Appearance :**

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Bhola Prasad  
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Surendra Kumar

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

ORAL ORDER

2      13-02-2024              Learned counsel for the petitioner is directed 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. 248 of 2023, dated 10.11.2023 for the offences punishable under Section 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Amendment Act, 2022.

4. As per prosecution case, total 203.580 litres of India made foreign liquor was recovered from the bathan of the co-accused Anand Kumar.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted



that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has three criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition in which he is on bail. The name of the petitioner was disclosed on the basis of confessional statement of co-accused person namely Raushan Kumar. No incriminating material 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.

6. Learned APP 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. 248 of 2023, subject to conditions as laid down under Section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

8. The application stands allowed.

**(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)**

Ranjeet/-

|   |  |   |  |
|---|--|---|--|
| U |  | T |  |
|---|--|---|--|

