

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.52371 of 2025

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-75 Year-2023 Thana- RUNISAIDPUR District- Sitamarhi

Sandeep Kumar @ Sanjeev Kumar @ Sanjip Kumar S/O Suresh Sahni R/O
Village- Lagma, Ward No.-7, P.S- Dumra, Distt.- Sitamarhi.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Santosh Kumar

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr.Rajendra Singh

**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 Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 75/2023 dated 09.02.2023 for the offences punishable u/s 30(a), 32, 36 and 41(1) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act and Sections 420, 467, 468 and 120B read with Section 34 of the I.P.C.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 3918.615 litres of illicit foreign liquor was recovered from the truck.

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. The other co-accused person has



already been granted bail by this court *vide* order dated 21.04.2025 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 22842/2025. As per para. 14 of the bail petition, the said vehicle does not belong to the petitioner. 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, Sitamarhi in connection with Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 75/2023, 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	
---	--	---	--

