

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT PATNA
Civil Writ Jurisdiction Case No 11072 of 2023

Rajesh Ranjan @ Sanjay Ray S/o Ramdev Ray R/o Village- Sundar Saray,
P.S.- Motipur, District- Muzaffarpur.

... .. Petitioner/s

Versus

1. The State of Bihar through the Principal Secretary, Registration, Excise and Prohibition Department, Govt. of Bihar, Patna.
2. The Additional Chief Secretary Excise, Bihar, Patna.
3. The Excise Commissioner, Bihar, Patna.
4. The Collector-cum-District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
5. The Addl. Collector-cum-Addl. District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur.
6. The Superintendent of Police, Muzaffarpur.
7. The Excise Sub-Inspector, Prahar Bal-2, Block Unit, Muzaffarpur.

... .. Respondent/s

Appearance :

For the Petitioner/s : Mr Raju Kumar, Advocate

For the Respondent/s : Mr Vikash Kumar, SC XI

CORAM: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE P B BAJANTHRI
and
HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE JITENDRA KUMAR

ORAL ORDER

(Per: HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE P B BAJANTHRI)

2 10-08-2023 In the instant petition, petitioner has prayed for the
following reliefs:

*(I) To issue a writ in the nature
of Certiorari for quashing the order
dated 16.03.2023 passed by the
Additional Chief Secretary, Excise,
Bihar, Patna in Excise Revision No.
09/2023.*



(II) To quash the order dated 28.11.2022 passed by the Excise Commissioner, Bihar, Patna in Excise Appeal No. 507 of 2022.

(III) To issue a writ in the nature of certiorari for quashing the order dated 10.03.2022 passed by the Addl. Collector-cum-Addl. District Magistrate, Muzaffarpur in Confiscation Case No. 57/2021-22 (in connection with Excise P.R. Case No. 16/2021 dated 03.06.2021).

(IV) Any other relief/s to which the petitioner is entitled in the facts and circumstances of the case.

2 Perusal of the records, it is evident that the petitioner has no locus in so far as subject matter of confiscated property/premises is concerned.

3 Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner is one of the co-sharers of the subject matter of property. In this regard, the petitioner has not produced any material to show that he is a co-sharer and the revenue records stand in his name. At this stage, learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that property stands in the name of his grandfather and he is no more. Therefore, unless and until revenue records stand in the name of the petitioner and other co-sharers, the petitioner has no locus.

4 Accordingly, the present petition stands disposed of



as not maintainable.

(P B Bajanthri, J)

(Jitendra Kumar, J)

M.E.H./-

U			
---	--	--	--

