

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.25902 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-506 Year-2019 Thana- GOVERNMENT OFFICIAL COMP.
District- Samastipur

Skindar Kumar Ray @ Sikander Kumar Ray Son of Yogendra Ray R/O Vill.-
Ghurlak, Ward No.- 07, P.S.- Waris Nagar, District - Samastipur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Anish Kumar
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Md. Matloob Rab

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

ORAL ORDER

2 04-07-2025 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 Excise P.S. Case No. 506 of 2019 dated 27.11.2019 registered for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 2207.16 litres of illicit foreign liquor was recovered from the hut of the co-accused, Ramesh Ray.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in this case. The apprehended co-accused person disclosed the name of the petitioner. No incriminating material has been



recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner. The petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery. The petitioner has three criminal antecedents in which he is on bail in all cases as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The co-accused person has already been granted regular bail by this Court vide order dated 20.02.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 2643 of 2025. 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 Excise P.S. Case No. 506 of 2019, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure, with a condition:-

(i) The petitioner is directed to remain physically present before the learned Court below on each and every date, failing which on two consecutive dates without reasonable cause, the bail bonds of the petitioner are liable to be cancelled.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

shivam/-

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

