

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR

MCRC No. 4667 of 2020

- Harprasad Dongre, S/o Jahilal, Aged About 47 Years R/o Amsena, Police Station Hirri, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

**---- Applicant
(In Jail)**

Versus

- State Of Chhattisgarh, Through - Station House Officer, Police Station Hirri, District Bilaspur Chhattisgarh.

---- Respondent

For Applicant :- Mr. Om P. Sahu, Advocate.

For State/Respondent :- Mr. Ravi Bhagat, Dy. G.A.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order on Board

07/08/2020

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 been arrested in connection with Crime No. 98/2020, registered at Police Station-Hirri Civil &

Revenue, District Bilaspur (CG), for the offence punishable under Section 34(2) of the Chhattisgarh Excise Act.

3. Case of the prosecution, in brief, is that, 6.300 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 is in custody since 06/07/2020.

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

6. I have heard learned counsel appearing for the parties.

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 **Banti Singh v. State of Chhattisgarh**¹, if the facts of present case are examined, it is apparent

¹ 2015(2) C.G.L.J. 341

that only 6.300 bulk liters of illicit liquor has been seized from him which is more than prescribed limit of 5 bulk liters, he is in custody since 06/07/2020 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 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 **Rs.25,000/-** 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:

(i) 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.

(ii) 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.

(iii) 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 23/03/2020

in the matter of **In Re : Contagion of COVID**
19 Virus in Prisons (Suo Moto 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
the bail bonds earlier, then he will be
required to furnish bail bonds.

10. Certified copy as per rules.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

Ankit