

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.51869 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-90 Year-2025 Thana- MADANPUR District- Aurangabad

Mukesh Kumar Verma Son of Kishun Mahto village- Haidar, Ps- Thaihar,
Dist- Hazaribagh Jharkhand

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Aman Vishal

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Madan Kumar

**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 Madanpur P.S. Case No. 90/2025 dated 25.02.2025 for the offences punishable u/s 30(a), 34 and 36 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 480 litres of illicit spirit was recovered from the Maruti car.

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. As per para. 8 of the bail petition, 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. The other co-accused person has already been granted bail by this court *vide* order dated 05.05.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 27460/2025. 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, Aurangabad in connection with Madanpur P.S. Case No. 90/2025, subject to conditions as laid down under section 482(2) of the B.N.S.S.

7. This application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

atul/-

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

