

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.35361 of 2025**

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-24 Year-2025 Thana- KURSAILA District- Katihar

Pinkesh Kumar Son of Mukesh Singh Resident of Village - Nayagaon, P.S.-
Nayagaon, District - Begusarai

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ashok Kumar, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Raj Kishor Singh, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 25-07-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with G.R. No. 466 of 2025 arising out of Kursela P.S. Case No. 24 of 2025 dated 23.01.2025 for the offences punishable u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, 71.55 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the vehicle bearing Reg. No. BR-01HH-9540 and 66.475 litres of illicit liquor was recovered from the vehicle bearing Reg. No. BR-09AP-6897. The co-accused, Himanshu Kumar and Abhishek Kumar were apprehended from the vehicle bearing Reg. No. BR-09AP-6897 and the co-accused, Rajeev Jha and Ashutosh Kumar were apprehended from the vehicle bearing Reg. No. BR-01HH-9540.



4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has two criminal antecedents as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The petitioner is the owner of the seized vehicle but the said vehicle was not being driven by the petitioner at the time of the alleged recovery. 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 a Coordinate Bench of this court vide order dated 29.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 35368/2025. 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, Katihar in connection with G.R. No. 466 of 2025 arising out of Kursela P.S. Case No. 24 of 2025, subject to conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S. 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	
---	--	---	--

