

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.31512 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-8 Year-2024 Thana- BENIPATTI District- Madhubani

Surendra Prasad Yadav S/o Bhogendra yadav R/o Village- Jhonjhi, Parol P.S.
Pandaual, District- Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Gagan Deo Yadav, Adv.
Mr. Rajesh Kumar, Adv.
Mr. Ravi Prakash, Adv.
For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Tarkeshwar Nath Thakur, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 11-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Benipatti P.S. Case No. 08 of 2024 dated 16.01.2024 for the offences punishable u/ss 272 and 273 of the Indian Penal Code and u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 36 litres of illicit Nepali country made liquor kept in a bag was recovered which was tied with a motorcycle.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner is innocent and has falsely been implicated in



this case. The petitioner has one criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is not named in the F.I.R. The petitioner has been made accused in this case only because he is the owner of the said vehicle but the same was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged recovery as stated in para 9 and 11 of the bail petition. 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. The co-accused person has already been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 16.04.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 26439/2024. 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 material available on the 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, Madhubani in connection with Benipatti P.S. Case No. 08 of 2024, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure with further 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 bond of the petitioner is liable to be cancelled.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Gautam/-

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

