

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1436 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District-
EASTCHAMPARAN(MOTIHARI)

=====

1. Sunil Kumar Singh @ Sunil Singh @ Sunil Kumar, Son of Suresh Singh,
Resident of Village- Rampur Khajuria, Police Station- Dumariyaghat, District-
East Champaran.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through The Principal Secretary, Department of Excise,
Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, East Champaran, Motihari.
3. The Superintendent of Police, East Champaran, Motihari.
4. The Officer in Charge, Dumariyaghat, Police Station, District- East Champaran,
Motihari.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dhurendra Kumar, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vivek Prasad, GP-7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 04-09-2017

Heard learned counsel for the parties.

2. The petitioner has invoked the writ jurisdiction of this Court to quash the order dated 27.02.2017 passed in connection with Dumariyaghat Police Station Case No.121 of 2016 by the learned 1st Additional Chief Judicial Magistrate, East Champaran at Motihari, under the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016. By the said order the prayer of the petitioner to release the seized Glamour Motorcycle, bearing registration No.BR-05Q/1961, has been refused on the ground that Section 60 of the Act bars the jurisdiction of the Courts.

3. Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that no purpose would be served by continued detention of the vehicle; rather it would get rotten. Moreover, the jurisdiction of the



Executive Authority to exercise judicial power of confiscation and sale is subjudice before a larger Bench of this Court in **L.P.A. No.1647 of 2015 Baleshwar Roy V. The State of Bihar & Ors.** Hence, till disposal of the L.P.A. aforesaid, the vehicle, in question, be released by way of interim custody in favour of the petitioner.

4. Learned counsel for the State-respondent opposed the prayer. However, does not dispute the factual position of pending of the L.P.A. aforesaid.

5. In the circumstances, let the above referred vehicle be released by way of ad interim custody in favour of the petitioner on execution of surety bond of Rs.50,000/- (Fifty Thousand), not in the form of cash/Bank Guarantee, along with two sureties of the like amount to the satisfaction of the authority concerned 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. The release order shall be subject to the result of the L.P.A. aforesaid.

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

(Birendra Kumar, J)

Mkr./-

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

