

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**M.Cr.C. No. 7233 of 2020**

1. Vinod Dhimer, son of Budhe Lal Dhimer, aged about 27 years, R/o. Village Borai, District Durg (C.G.)

2. Sanat Yadav, son of Sabal Yadav, aged about 25 years, R/o. Village Borai, District Durg (C.G.)
(In jail)

---- Applicants

Versus

State of Chhattisgarh, Through : The District Magistrate, Rajnandgaon, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.)

---- Non-applicant

For Applicant : Mr. Jitendra Gupta, Advocate.

For Non-applicant / State : Mr. Ravi Kumar Bhagat, Dy. Govt. Advocate.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Sanjay K. Agrawal

Order On Board

04/11/2020

(1) Proceedings of this matter have been taken-up for hearing through video conferencing.

(2) The accused/applicants have preferred this bail application under Section 439 of the Code of Criminal Procedure for releasing them on regular bail during trial in connection with Crime No. 427/2020 registered at Police Station – Dongergarh, District Rajnandgaon (C.G.) for the offence punishable under Section 34(2) of the Chhattisgarh Excise Act.

(3) Case of the prosecution, in brief, the applicant No. 1 was found in possession

of 12.249 bulk liters of illicit liquor *whereas* the applicant No. 2 was found in possession of 22.680 bulk liters of illicit liquor unauthorizedly and without authority of law and thereby committed the aforesaid offence.

(4) Learned counsel for the applicants submits that the applicants have been falsely implicated in the crime in question as they have not committed any offence. He further submits that as the applicants have been arrested on 22.09.2020 and trial is likely to take some time for its final disposal and no useful purpose would be served in further detaining them in jail, he may be released on bail.

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

(6) I have heard the 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 **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 12.249 bulk liters of illicit liquor has been seized from applicant No.1 *and* 22.680 bulk liters of illicit liquor has been seized from applicant No. 2, which are more than prescribed limit, but looking to the fact that the applicants have been arrested on 22.09.2020, case is triable by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, 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 applicants 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 their appearance as and when directed, the applicants shall be released on bail, subject to following conditions:

- That, the applicants shall furnish a specific undertaking that while on bail, they will not commit any excise offence, otherwise bail granted to them shall be liable to be cancelled and shall co-operate the prosecution during trial.
- That, the accused/applicants shall make themselves available for interrogation before the concerned Investigating Officer as and when required and the accused/applicants 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/applicants shall not act, in any manner, which will be prejudicial to fair and expeditious trial.

(9) It is made clear that if the applicants have 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), they 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 they have not furnished the bail bonds earlier, then they will be required to furnish bail bonds.

Sd/-
(Sanjay K. Agrawal)
Judge

D/-

