

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.6394 of 2019

=====

Haleem, aged about 44 years, Male, Son of Hazrat Ali, Resident of
Kumaripur, P.S. Manihari, District- Katihar.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through Principal Secretary, Department of Registration,
Excise and Prohibition, Government of Bihar.
2. The Excise Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
3. The District Collector, Katihar.
4. The State of Bihar through the Director General of Police, Bihar.
5. The Superintendent of Police, Katihar.
6. Station House Officer, Manihari.

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Ajit Kumar Singh, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr.Vikash Kumar (SC11)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANJANI KUMAR SHARAN
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE JYOTI SARAN)

Date : 07-05-2019

Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned
counsel appearing on behalf of the State.

The petitioner prays for provisional release of his



Pulsar 220 C Bajaj Motor Cycle bearing registration No. BR 39Q0566, which has been seized in connection with Manihari P.S. Case No. 293 of 2018 for the offence punishable under Section 37(b) of the Bihar Prohibition and Excise Act, 2016.

The allegation against the petitioner is of drunken driving and in such condition, the vehicle has been seized. Undisputedly, there is no recovery from the vehicle as it is also confirmed from the seizure list.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and taking note of the legal positions settled by this Court in the case of **Diwakar Kumar Singh Vs. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Excise Department & Ors. reported in 2018 (3) PLJR 403**, we direct for release of the vehicle in question in favour of the petitioner within a fortnight, on furnishing/production of the document showing the ownership of the vehicle and registration certificate in the name of the petitioner supporting the claim of the petitioner before the Designated Court below because neither the F.I.R. nor the seizure list reflects any reason for proceeding to be continued against the vehicle in question.

Since nothing has been recovered from the vehicle, there is no question of submission of any surety bond in view of



the judgment of the Hon'ble Division Bench of this Court.

With this observations/directions above, this writ
petition is allowed.

(Jyoti Saran, J)

(Anjani Kumar Sharan, J)

Nasimul/-

AFR/NAFR	NAFR
CAV DATE	N/A
Uploading Date	13-05-2019
Transmission Date	N/A

