

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1183 of 2017

Arising Out of PS.Case No. -null Year- null Thana -null District- BHABHUA (KAIMUR)

=====

1. Pradeep Kumar Gupta son of Rajendra Sah @ Rajendra Pd. Gupta resident of Village : Baruara, P.S. : Ramgarh, District : Kaimur at Bhabhua.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Chief Secretary, Government of Bihar, Patna.
2. The District Magistrate, Kaimur at Bhabhua.
3. The Superintendent of Police, Kaimur at Bhabhua.
4. The Excise Inspector, Kaimur at Bhabhua.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Dharmesh Kumar Shrivastava, Adv

For the Respondent/s : Mr. Vivek Prasad, GP-7

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 22-08-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The motorcycle of this petitioner bearing registration No.BR-45E/5573 was seized in connection with Excise Case No.203 of 2016, a case registered for the alleged violation of the excise laws.

Submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the Collector, Kaimur, Bhabhua, confiscated the said motorcycle on 09.12.2016 in Confiscation (Excise) Case No.112 of 2016-2017 and appeal against the said order was dismissed on 03.07.2017 in Appeal Case No.13 of 2017. In this writ petition both the aforesaid orders of confiscation and dismissal of appeal are



under challenge.

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.

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.

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.

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



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.50,000/- (Fifty Thousand), 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	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	24.08.2017
Transmission Date	24.08.2017

