

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1648 of 2017

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

=====

Mukesh Sokin @ Mukesh Shokeen, Son of Jashwant Singh, Resident of Mohalla-
House No.1, Mangolpur Khurd, P.S.-Mangolpuri, District-New Delhi.

.... Petitioner.

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Excise Department Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Inspector General of Police, Tirhut Range, Muzaffarpur.
4. The Collector –cum- District Magistrate, Sitamarhi.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Sitamarhi.
6. The Sub-Divisional Officer, Sitamarhi.
7. The Circle Officer-cum-Executive Magistrate, Runnisaidpur at Sitamarhi.

.... Respondents

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Sunil Kumar Pandey, Adv.

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Kumar Manish, Adv.

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 18-09-2017

Heard the learned counsel for the parties.

2. The bus of this petitioner bearing Registration
No. U.P.17-AT-2838 was seized in connection with
Runnisaidpur P.S. Case No. 355 of 2017, a case registered
for the alleged violation of the Excise laws.

3. Submission of the learned counsel for the
petitioner is that the Collector, Sitamarhi, confiscated the
said vehicle on 08.08.2017 in Confiscation (Excise) Case No.
377 of 2017. In this writ petition the aforesaid order of
confiscation is under challenge.

4. 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 order 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.

5. 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.

6. 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 operation of the impugned order shall remain stated till further order and shall be subject to the result of L.P.A. aforesaid.

7. 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.20,00,000/- (Twenty 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.

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

(Birendra Kumar, J)

Nitesh/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	20.09.2017
Transmission Date	20.09.2017

