

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No.2293 of 2016**

1. Harishankar Chandravanshi, son of Shri Banshi Lal, aged about 42 years, Caste Mahar.
2. Manoj Yadav, son of Ramanand Yadav, aged about 27 years.

Both are resident of Village Gudhiyari, P.S. Ranitarai, District Durg (CG).

---- Applicants**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh, through the District Magistrate (wrongly mentioned as Collector), Durg (CG).

---- Non-applicant

For Applicants : Shri Praveen Kumar Dhurandhar, Advocate

For Non-applicant : Shri Suvigya Awasthi, Panel Lawyer

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal
Order On Board

09/05/2016**(1)** Heard.

(2) This is an application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the applicants, who have been arrested in connection with Crime No.48/2016 registered at Police Station Ranitarai, District Durg, for the offence punishable under Section 34(2) of the Chhattisgarh Excise Act, 1915.

(3) Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that present applicants were found in joint possession of 64.980 bulk liters of illicit liquor.

(4) Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have falsely been implicated in the case, and therefore, the applicants

may be released on bail.

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

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

(7) 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 64.980 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 and they are in custody from 17.03.2016 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.

(8) 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/- each with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court of their appearance as and when directed, the applicants shall be released on bail, subject to following conditions:

1. 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.

2. 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.
3. 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

L/-