

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA

Criminal Writ Jurisdiction Case No.1075 of 2017

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

- =====
1. Ashok Sharma, son of Bhishwanath Sharma, Resident of Village- Basantpur, P.O.+P.S.- Basantpur, District- Siwan.

.... Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar Through Collector, Gopalganj At Gopalganj, Bihar.
2. The Commissioner Excise Bihar, Patna.
3. The Collector Gopalganj, Bihar.
4. Officer in charge, Phulwaria Police Station, District- Gopalganj.

.... Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr. Rana Pratap Singh, Advocate
For the Respondent/s : Mr. Lalit Kishore, PAAG-1

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BIRENDRA KUMAR

ORAL JUDGMENT

Date: 26-07-2017

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and the State.

The Bolero vehicle of this petitioner bearing registration No.OR09E-3491 was seized in connection with Phulwaria P.S. Case No.157 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, Gopalganj, confiscated the said vehicle on 11.04.2017 in Confiscation (Excise) Case No.23 of 2017 and appeal against the said order was dismissed on 03.07.2017 in Appeal Case No.20 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



petitioner by way of ad interim custody on execution of surety bond of Rs.5,00,000/- (Five 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	NAFR
CAV DATE	NA
Uploading Date	31.07.2017
Transmission Date	31.07.2017

