

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**MCRC No. 2122 of 2020**

- Smt. Urmila Yadav, W/o Shiv Kumar Yadav, Aged About 45 Years Occupation House Wife, R/o Mo. Dairy Farm Road, Gandhinagar, Police Station- Gandhinagar, Tehsil- Ambikapur, District- Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---- Applicant**Versus**

- State of Chhattisgarh Through - Station House Officer, Police Station- Gandhinagar, Dehat, District- Surguja, Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Neeraj Kumar Mehta, Advocate.
For Respondent	:	Mr. Ayaz Naved, G.A.

Hon'ble Smt. Justice Rajani Dubey**Order on Board****18/05/2020**

- Heard on Admission.
- Admit.
- The accused/applicant has moved this first bail application under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for releasing her on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 88/2020 registered at Police Station – Police Station- Gandhinagar, Dehat, District- Surguja, (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 34 (2) of the C.G. Excise Act.
- It is the case of the prosecution that, on 02.03.2020, total 80

bulk liters of illicit liquor has been seized by the police from the custody of applicant and thereby committed the offence.

- Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has been falsely implicated in the crime in question. He further submits that as the applicant is in custody since 03.03.2020 and the trial is likely to take some time for its final disposal, she may be released on bail.
- On the other hand, counsel for the State opposes the bail application.
- Taking into consideration the condition incorporated in Section 59-A(ii) of the C.G. Excise Act, 1915, and bearing in mind the principles of law laid down in **Banti Singh v. State of Chhattisgarh** (M.Cr.C. No.6846 of 2014), decided on 05.01.2015), if the facts of present case are examined, it is apparent that only 80 bulk liters of illicit liquor has been seized from her which is more than prescribed limit of 5 bulk liters, but looking to the fact that the applicant is in custody since 03.03.2020, trial is likely to take some more time and further taking into account the nature and gravity of offence and plea raised by the applicant that she has falsely been implicated in case, I am of the opinion that present is the fit case, in which, the applicant should be enlarged on regular bail.
- Accordingly, the application is allowed. It is directed that on

furnishing a personal bond in the sum of Rs. 50,000/-, with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court for her appearance as and when directed, the applicant shall be released on bail, subject to following conditions:

- That, the applicant shall furnish a specific, undertaking that while on bail, she shall not commit any excise offence, otherwise bail granted to her shall be liable to be cancelled and shall co-operate the prosecution during trial.
- That, the accused/applicant shall make herself available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required and the accused/applicant shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him/her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer.
- That, the accused/applicant shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

**Sd/-
(Rajani Dubey)
Judge**