

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1411 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- NALANDA (BIHARSHARIFF)

- =====
1. Prem Kumar Ranjan, Son of Sri Shiv Kumar Kishore, Resident of Village-Mohiuddinpur, P.S.- Islampur, District- Nalanda, at present resident of Flat No.405, Block-B, Sant Vihar Apartment, East Lohanipur, P.S.- Kadam Kuan, District- Patna.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar.
2. The Principal Secretary, Home (Police) Department, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Principal Secretary, Excise and Prohibition Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
4. The Director General of Police, Bihar, Patna.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Nalanda, at Biharsharif.
6. The S.H.O. Laheri Police Station, Biharsharif (Nalanda).

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dilip Kumar No.1, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr. P.N. Shahi, AAG-6

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 04-09-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The Scorpio vehicle of this petitioner bearing registration No.BR-01PH/5967 was seized in connection with Laheri P.S. Case No.282 of 2017 for alleged violation of the Excise law.

3. The petitioner moved the learned Additional Sessions Judge-IV-cum-Special Judge, Excise, Nalanda, for release of the vehicle and the prayer was refused on 24.07.2017 mainly for the reason that Section 60 of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act,



2016, bars jurisdiction of the Court to entertain release of the seized articles.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that no purpose is going to be served by continued detention of the seized vehicle. He further submits that the power of the Executive Authority to confiscate the vehicle is under challenge in **LPA No.1647 of 2015 Baleshwar Roy V. The State of Bihar & Ors.** before a larger Bench of this Court on the ground that such power is exercisable only by a judicial authority. Hence, till disposal of the L.P.A. aforesaid interim custody may be ordered in favour of the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the State-respondent has opposed the prayer. However, does not dispute the aforesaid factual position of the pending issue in the L.P.A. aforesaid.

6. Finding substance in the submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner especially the fact that no purpose would be served by continued detention of the said vehicle, let referred vehicle be released in favour of the petitioner by way of ad interim custody on execution of surety bond of Rs.10,00,000/- (Ten 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. This order shall be subject to the result of the L.P.A. aforesaid.

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

(Birendra Kumar, J)

Mkr./-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	06.09.2017
Transmission Date	

