

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1496 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- JAMUI

=====

1. Rajnish Kumar son of Shri Raghunath Mahto, Resident of Village- Chilmil,
Tola- Chhapki, P.S.- Muffasil, District- Begusarai.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Excise Deptt.
2. The District Collector, Jamui
3. The Superintendent of Police, Jamui.
4. The Officer-in- Charge of Sono Police Station, District- Jamui.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rakesh Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Anil Kumar Sinha, GA-1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 04-09-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

2. The Bolt Car of this petitioner bearing registration
No.BR09Q-8436 was seized in connection with Sono P.S. Case
No.100 of 2016, a case registered for the alleged violation of the
Excise laws.

3. Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is
that by order dated 05.07.2017, the Collector, Jamui, confiscated the
vehicle of the petitioner in connection with Confiscation (Excise)
Case No.15 of 2016.

4. Further prayer of the petitioner is to allow interim
release of the vehicle bearing registration No. BR09Q-8436 of the



petitioner, which was seized in connection with the aforesaid case.

5. Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the jurisdiction of the Executive Officer to confiscate the vehicle is subjudice before a larger Bench of this Court in **LPA No.1647 of 2015 Baleshwar Roy V. The State of Bihar & Ors.** In the circumstances, till pendency of the L.P.A. aforesaid operation of the impugned orders be stayed and the vehicle in question be released in favour of the petitioner as no purpose is going to be served by its continued detention in police lockup.

6. Learned counsel for the State-respondent opposed the prayer on the ground that the authorities are competent under the provisions of Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2106, to confiscate. Hence, the petitioner cannot get interim relief of release of the vehicle.

7. Considering the fact that authority of the executive to confiscate the seized vehicle under the Excise Act and other provisions is under consideration before a larger Bench of this Court as referred above, the proceeding of the aforesaid confiscation case shall remain stayed till further order and shall be subject to the result of L.P.A. aforesaid.

8. Since no purpose is going to be served by continued detention of the vehicle, let the same be released in favour of the



petitioner by way of ad interim custody on execution of surety bond of Rs. 6,00,000/- (Six Lacs), not in the form of cash/Bank Guarantee, along with two sureties of the like amount with condition that the petitioner would not dispose of the said vehicle without permission of the authority concerned and shall produce as and when required by the Court.

With the aforesaid observation, this writ application stands disposed of.

(Birendra Kumar, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	
Transmission Date	

