

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No.18088 of 2019

=====

Munni Devi, Wife of Wakil Thakur, Resident of Village-Bisauli Urf
Batrauliya, P.O.-Bakhra, P.S.-Saraiya, District-Muzaffarpur

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Excise Department,
Government of Bihar, Patna
2. The District Magistrate, District - Muzaffarpur
3. The Superintendent of Police, District - Muzaffarpur
4. The Officer in-charge of Saraiya P.S., District - Muzaffarpur

... .. Respondent/s

=====

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr.Yugal Kishore
For the Respondent/s : Mr.Kumar Manish (SC-5)

=====

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH
and
HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANIL KUMAR SINHA
ORAL JUDGMENT
(Per: HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE DINESH KUMAR SINGH)

Date : 06-01-2020

Heard Mr. Yugal Kishore, learned counsel for the
petitioner and Mr. Kumar Manish, learned SC-5 for the
respondent-State.

The present writ application has been filed for release
of Bolero vehicle bearing Registration No. BR 06P 4108, in
favour of petitioner, which has been seized in connection with
Saraiya P.S. Case No. 375 of 2018, registered for the offences
punishable under Sections 272 and 276 of the Indian Penal
Code, 1860 and Sections 30(a), 38 and 41 of Bihar Prohibition
and Excise Act, 2016, as amended by the Amendment Act 8 of



2018 (hereinafter referred to as 'the Act').

The relief, as prayed for by learned counsel for the petitioner as stipulated in paragraph no.1 of the writ application reads as follows :-

“1. That this is an application for issuance of a direction or directions, order/orders to the respondent to release the vehicle (Bolero four wheeler) bearing registration no. BR-06P 4108, Chasis No. GA74L94207, Engine No. MA1PL2GAK72L54880 of the petitioner, which is seized in connection with Saraiya P.S. Case No. 375/2018, dated 30/08/2018 under Section 272 & 273 of the I.P.C. and section 30(a)/38/41 of Bihar Prohibition & Excise Act, 2016.”

The prosecution case is that the vehicle in question was intercepted and from the alleged vehicle, 60 litres of Indian Made Foreign Liquor were recovered, leading to registration of Sariya P.S. Case No. 375 of 2018.

It is submitted by learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner claims to be the registered owner of the vehicle in question. The copy of the registration certificate of the vehicle in question has been brought on record as Annexure-1. Moreover, the vehicle in question was hired by someone and subsequently seizure was made. The petitioner was not present in the vehicle in question, while seizure was made. A statement has been made in paragraph no.10 of the petition that the confiscation proceeding is pending before the District



Magistrate, Muzaffarpur. Though, neither any confiscation number nor the date of its initiation has been mentioned in the petition.

It is submitted by learned S.C.-5 that proceeding of the confiscation proceeding will be concluded within a time frame.

Considering the settled law that once the confiscation proceeding is initiated, the exercise of discretionary jurisdiction under Article 226 of the Constitution of India having self imposed restriction can be exercised in certain exceptional or monstrous situation. Considering the view taken by the Apex Court in the case of **State of Karnataka Vs. K. Krishnan (2000) 7 Supreme Court Cases 80** and in the case of **State of West Bengal and Ors. Vs. Sujit Kumar Rana, (2004) 4 Supreme Court Cases 129**, a Full Bench of this Court in the case of **Baleswar Roy Vs. The State of Bihar and Ors , 2018(4) PLJR 970**, held as follows:

“62. It may, however, be added that Article 226 of the Constitution of India provides power to the High Court to issue writs to any person or authority, including in appropriate cases, any Government, any order or writs (including writs in the nature of *habeas corpus*, *mandamus*, *prohibition*, *quo warranto* and *certiorari*, or any of them, for the enforcement of any of the rights conferred by Part-III and for any other purpose).



Similarly Article 227 of the Constitution of India provides the power of superintendence over all Courts and Tribunals throughout the territories in relation to which any High Court exercises its jurisdiction. The powers of the High Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India cannot be curtailed under any circumstance, as the power flows from the Constitution itself. No statutory bar can affect the power of the High Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India.

63. Despite such wide and untrammelled powers, without any circumscription by external restrictions, the Courts have evolved certain self-imposed limits while exercising these powers. The High Courts, normally, would not go beyond justified inhibitions under any Statute except where there is a complete jettisoning of rule of law or under exceptional circumstances which demand timely judicial interdict. This inhibition is basically ordained, keeping in mind that there is a national weal behind any valid piece of Legislation incorporating and inhering in itself the social objective behind any Legislation. Though, no limitations or fetters have been put on the powers of the High Court under Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution of India, as the High Courts perform as sentinel on the qui-vive, but such power is not to be exercised casually and without coming to the conclusion that non-exercise of such power would lead to positive injustice. Times without number, it has been held by the High Courts that only under condition of a person establishing that substantial injustice has or is likely to ensue, such extraordinary powers can be exercised. It needs no adumbration by this date that the plenary powers of the High Court have only to be exercised in the interest of justice.

64. Thus, an order of release may be



passed under Article 226/227 of the Constitution of India, even pending confiscation proceedings, but only when it is established before the Court that the procedure prescribed and the law in that regard has been completely flouted and that there is complete violation of the procedure prescribed for confiscation, viz., notice to the offender before confiscation, allowing him opportunity of giving written representation and affording hearing on the issue to him and that such injustice cannot be remedied without the exercise of the extraordinary power.

65. Needless to state that under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, the Court will not go into the disputed question of facts.

66. Thus, the powers directing for release of the vehicles or goods, during the pendency of the confiscation, can only be sparingly exercised under monstrous situations and circumstances when injustice occurs because of non-fulfillment of the conditions for confiscation.”

Since vehicle in question was seized on 30.08.2018, it is expected from the Collector/District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur to conclude the proceeding of the confiscation case, if any, arising out of Saraiya P.S. Case No. 375 of 2018 and dispose of the same by a reasoned and speaking order within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt/ production of a copy of this order in accordance with law.

The petitioner is also expected to appear regularly and participate in the confiscation proceeding.

Accordingly, with the above observation and



direction, the present writ application is disposed of.

(Dinesh Kumar Singh, J)

(Anil Kumar Sinha, J)

Amrendra/-

AFR/NAFR	
CAV DATE	
Uploading Date	10.01.2020
Transmission Date	

