

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS No.81165 of 2024

Arising Out of PS. Case No.-171 Year-2022 Thana- LAUKAHI District- Madhubani

=====

Sunil Kumar @ Nitish Kumar S/O Ram Bilas Yadav @ Ramvilas Yadav R/o
Vill. - Atari, P.S - Laukahi, District - Madhubani

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

The State of Bihar

... .. Opposite Party/s

=====

Appearance :

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

For the Opposite Party/s : Mr. Asha Devi, APP

=====

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

ORAL ORDER

2 19-02-2025 Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
Additional Public Prosecutor for the State.

2. The petitioner is apprehending his arrest in connection with Laukahi P.S. Case No. 171 of 2022 dated 09.07.2022 for the offences punishable u/ss 272, 273 read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code and u/s 30(a) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act.

3. As per the prosecution case, total 423 litres of illicit Nepali liquor was recovered from the premises of Raja Salhesh Temple.

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. It is further submitted that the petitioner has no concern with the alleged recovery rather the recovery has been made from an open place which is accessible to anyone. Nothing has been recovered from the conscious possession of the petitioner, hence no case is made out against the petitioner. The co-accused person has already been granted anticipatory bail by this court vide order dated 11.12.2024 passed in Cr. Misc. No. 67408 of 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 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, Jhanjharpur, Madhubani in connection with Laukahi P.S. Case No. 171 of 2022, subject to conditions as laid down under section 438(2) of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

7. The application stands allowed.

(Chandra Prakash Singh, J)

shivam/-

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

