

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.43031 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-280 Year-2024 Thana- KISHANPUR District- Supaul

Bipin Kumar S/O Sunil Kumar Yadav @ Sunil Yadav R/O Village- Phulparas,
Ward No.-10, P.S- Phulparas, District- Madhubani.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Jitendra Kumar Bharti, Adv.

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Sanjay Kumar Sharma, APP

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

ORAL ORDER

2 08-08-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The Petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Kishanpur P.S. Case No. 280 of 2024 dated 30.11.2024 for the offences punishable u/ss 317(5) of the B.N.S. and u/ss 30(a) and 41(1) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 282 illicit Nepali country made liquor was recovered from the Tempo.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner has falsely been implicated in this case. The petitioner has no criminal antecedent as stated in para 3 of the bail petition. The name of the petitioner has sprung up in the



confessional statement of the co-accused, Sharwan Kumar Singh. The petitioner is the owner of the seized vehicle as stated in para 17 of the bail petition but he has no concern with the alleged recovery. Nothing 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, Supaul in connection with Kishanpur P.S. Case No. 280 of 2024, subject to conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

Gautam/-

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

