

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.1888 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-587 Year-2024 Thana- Excise P.S. District- Kishanganj

Mintu Kumar S/O Jagdeesh Ray R/O Vill-Rajala Birmamath Mishrauliya, Ps-
Afjalpur, Dist- Vaishali

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Priyesh Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Asha Kumari

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

ORAL ORDER

2 28-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Special Case No. 600 of 2024 arising out of Madya Nisedh P.S. Case No. 587 of 2024 dated 10.05.2024 registered for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) and 32(3) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 609 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. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The other co-accused person has



already been granted bail by this court *vide* order dated 09.07.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 48025/2024. The petitioner is the owner of the said vehicle but the said vehicle was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged occurrence. 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.

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, Kishanganj in connection with Madya Nisedh P.S. Case No. 587 of 2024, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

7. This application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

