

NAFR

**HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR****M.Cr.C.No.3550 of 2020**

- Rajesh Sisodiya S/o Jahar Singh, Aged About 35 Years R/o Siltara, Police Station Dharsiwa, Civil And Revenue District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---- Applicant

**Versus**

- State Of Chhattisgarh Through Police Station Dharsiwa, Civil And Revenue District Raipur Chhattisgarh

---Non-applicant

---

For Applicant : Shri Kishore Narayan, Advocate

For Non-applicant : Ku. Veena Nair, Dy. Advocate General

---

**Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal****Order on Board****08.10.2020.**

1. Proceedings of this matter have been taken up through Video Conferencing.
2. This is an application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. for grant of regular bail to the applicant who has have been arrested in connection with Crime No. 87 of 2020, registered at Police Station – Dharsiwa, Civil & Revenue Distt. Raipur (CG), for the offence punishable under Section 34(2) of the Chhattisgarh Excise Act, 1915.
- 3 Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that, 30.720 bulk liters of illicit

liquor was seized by the police from the present applicant.

4. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that the applicant has not committed any offence and he has falsely been implicated in crime in question. He further submits that the applicant has already been acquitted from 07 other similar cases and one case is still pending and the same has been falsely implicated against him. He is in custody since 27.02.2020.

5. On the other hand, learned counsel for the State opposes the bail application.

6. I have heard counsel appearing for the parties and perused the case diary.

7. 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 the matter of Banti Singh v. State of Chhattisgarh<sup>1</sup>, if the facts of present case are examined, it is apparent that only 30.720 bulk liters of illicit liquor has been seized from him which is more than prescribed limit of 5 bulk liters, but looking to the fact that the applicant is in custody from 27.02.2020 and case is triable by the Judicial Magistrate First Class and 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 he has falsely been implicated in case, I am of the opinion that present is the fit case, in which, the applicant should

---

<sup>1</sup> 2015(2) C.G.L.J. 341

be enlarged on regular bail.

8. Accordingly, the bail application filed under Section 439 of the Cr.P.C. is allowed. It is directed that on furnishing a personal bond in the sum of ₹ 50,000/- with one surety in the like sum to the satisfaction of the concerned Court for his 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, he will not commit any excise offence, otherwise bail granted to him shall be liable to be cancelled and shall co-operate the prosecution during trial.
- That, the accused/applicant shall make himself 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.

9. It is made clear that if the applicant has already been released on bail pursuant to the bail bonds already furnished in view of the order

passed by the High Power Committee constituted in compliance of the order of the Supreme Court of India dated 23.3.2020 in the matter of In **Re : Contagion of COVID 19 Virus in Prisons** (Suo Motu Writ Petition (C) No.1/2020), he need not furnish bail bonds afresh and the bail bonds already furnished shall be deemed to be the bail bonds furnished in compliance of the order of this Court, but if he has not furnished bail bonds earlier, then he will be required to furnish bail bonds.

Sd/-

(Sanjay K. Agrawal)  
JUDGE

Bini