

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 1084 of 2016**

1. Rajkumar Pardhi son of Brijlal Pardhi, aged about 45 years, resident of Village Bhava Thana-Patewa, District Mahasamund (C.G.)
2. Mahesh Tandi, son of Kaliya Tandi, aged about 35 years, resident of Village-Murumdih, Thana-Rajadevari Chowki-Baya, District Balodabazar

---- Applicants**Versus**

State Of Chhattisgarh Through: Station House Officer,
Police Station – Patewa, District Mahasamund (C.G.)

----Non-applicant

For Applicants: Mr. Vikash Pradhan, Advocate.
For Non-applicant/State: Mr. Vivek Singhal, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal**Order On Board****08/03/2016**

(1) The accused/applicants have moved this bail application under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for releasing them on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 25/2016 registered at Police Station Patewa, District-Mahasamund (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 34(2) of Chhattisgarh Excise Act, 1915.

(2) Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that 24.84 bulk liters of illicit liquor was seized by the police from the present applicants.

(3) Learned counsel for the applicants submits that in Criminal

Case No.104/2013 registered against the applicants relating to Excise offence, they have been acquitted by the jurisdictional criminal court on 24.09.2013 and, thus, it is a first offence registered against the applicants. He further submits that applicants have falsely been implicated in the case, and therefore, the applicants may be released on bail.

(4) On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application.

(5) I have heard the counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

(6) Taking into consideration the condition incorporated in Section 59-A(ii) of the C.G. Excise Act, 1915, and bearing in mind the principles of law laid down in **Banti Singh v. State of Chhattisgarh** (M.Cr.C. No.6846 of 2014, decided on 05.01.2015), if the facts of present case are examined, it is apparent that only 24.84 bulk liters of liquor has been seized from them which is more than prescribed limit of 5 bulk liters, but looking to the fact that it is first offence of the applicants, which is apparent from the orders dated 24.09.2013 passed by the jurisdictional criminal court in Criminal Case No.104/2013, by which applicants have been acquitted of the offence relating the excise offence and they are in custody from 28.01.2016 and case is triable by the Judicial Magistrate First Class and trial is likely to take some more time and further taking into account the nature and gravity of offence and plea raised by the applicants that they have falsely been implicated in case, I am of the opinion that

present is the fit case, in which, the applicants should be enlarged on regular bail.

(7) Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is allowed. It is directed that on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs.25,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court for their appearance as and when directed, the applicants shall be released on bail, subject to following conditions:

- That, the applicants shall furnish a specific undertaking that while on bail, they will not commit any excise offence, otherwise bail granted to them shall be liable to be cancelled and shall co-operate the prosecution during trial.
- That, the accused/applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required and the accused/applicants shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.
- That, the accused/applicants shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

Certified copy, as per rules.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-