

IN THE COURT OF JUDL. MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS, BANPUR.

Present. : Miss Sarmistha Dash, LL.B.,
Judl. Magistrate First Class,
Banpur.

Date of argument :05.09.2014
Date of Judgment :08.09.2014

G.R. No. 204/2014
T.R. No. 232/2014

State	Prosecution
-Versus-		
Rabindra Dalai, aged about 50 years, S/o Hadibandhu Dalai. Vill: Dharmasala road Banpur, P.S:Banpur, Dist: Khurda.	Accused.

Offence:Under Section 47(a) of the B & O Excise Act, 1915.

For the Prosecution. : Sri J.Pradhan, APP.
For the Defence. : Sri G.S.Sarangi & others.

J U D G M E N T.

01. The accused stands charged for the offence punishable Under Sections 47(a) of Bihar and Orissa Excise Act.

02. The case of the prosecution in brief runs thus:

One Niranjana Mohanty A.S.I of police Banpur P.S on 14.05.2014 in the evening hour he along with other police staffs performing patrolling duty near College chhaka, Banpur area got reliable information that the accused was illegally carrying liquor in a Jarry bag from college side to thana side. So they proceeded to the spot and saw that the accused was coming towards thana side with a jarry bag. They detained him and on search they found that the accused was possessed 25 bottles of Aska-40 C.S. liquor each containing 200ml. On demand he

failed to show any license or authority for such possession and carrying of liquor. After verification he brought the accused along with the liquor to the P.S.

Upon such report P.S. Case No.134/2014 was registered and investigation was carried out and after completion of investigation as prima facie evidence is well made out against the accused, the I.O. submitted charge sheet against him. Hence this trial.

03. The plea of defence is one of complete denial and false implication.

04. The point for determination in this case emerges as follows:

- (a) Whether on 14.05.2014 at evening hour 25 bottles of Aska - 40 C.S. liquor was seized from the conscious and exclusive possession of the accused?
- (b) Whether the seized liquor was nothing but C.S. liquor?

05. In order to prove its case, prosecution has examined as many as six P.Ws in its favour. Out of which P.W.1 is the informant, P.W.2 is a Havildar who accompanied with the patrolling party, P.W.6 is the I.O and rest are independent seizure witnesses. Where as defence has examined none

06. In order to prove a case U/s 47(a) Bihar and Orissa Excise Act, it is for the prosecution to prove not only the fact of seizure from the exclusive and conscious possession of the accused but also the seized articles to be nothing but C.S liquor.

07. This is a case U/s 47(a) Bihar and Orissa Excise Act. In order to substantiate the case against the accused, it is necessary to scrutinize the case of prosecution. During course of the trial P.W1 who is the informant of this case deposed that on the alleged date the accused

was coming by carrying a jarry bag in a suspicious manner so they detained him and on search found 40 bottles Aska -40 C.S liquor. As the accused failed to produce any license or authority so he seized it. During his cross examination he said that he has not undergone a special training to identify the liquor. P.W.2 deposed that on the alleged date the accused was coming by carrying a jarry bag containing Aska-40 then they took him to P.S. During his cross examination he said that they had not conducted any test at the spot. P.Ws 3 & 4 deposed that they do not know the informant as well as the accused in this case. During their cross examination they said that nothing has been seized in their presence. P.W.5 deposed that he does not know anything about this case. He also deposed that he heard that the accused was caught by informant while he was carrying liquor. P.W.6 the I.O deposed that he took up investigation of this case. During investigation he examined the witnesses, visited the spot and prepared the spot map.

On careful scrutinization of the evidence available on record it is found that the witnesses to the seizure list did not support the fact of seizure of liquor from the possession of the accused in their presence. Though the prosecution has examined the informant but during his cross examination he said that he has not undergone any special training to identify the liquor. The I.O in this case during his cross examination said that he has not sent the seized liquor for chemical examination. Further the seized articles were not produced before this court for its perusal. Hence, there is no proof in the record to prove that the seized liquids were nothing but the C.S. liquor. Further the fact of seizure from the conscious and exclusive possession of the accused is also not proved as none of the independent witnesses have corroborated the prosecution

version. Hence in view of the above contradictions and due to lack of independent corroboration and in absence of any test, I am of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove its case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts.

07. In the result, the accused is found not guilty for the offence U/s.47 (a) of Bihar and Orissa Excise Act, 1915 and acquitted thereof U/s.248 (1) of Cr.P.C. He be released from the custody forthwith.

The seized materials, if any be destroyed after four months of the appeal period, if no appeal is preferred and if preferred be dealt as per the order of the appellate court.

Enter the case as mistake of fact.

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Banpur

This judgment typed to my dictation, corrected by me and pronounced in the open court, given under my hand and seal of this court, this the 8th day of September, 2014.

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Banpur.

List of witnesses examined for Prosecution.

PW.1	Niranjana Naik
PW.2	Kedarnath Panda.
P.W.3	Rankanath Mohapatra.
P.W.4	Ladu Kishore Mohapatra.
P.W.5	Purna Chandra Panda.
P.W.6	Rabi Chandra Maharana

List of witnesses examined for defence.

None.

List of Exhibits marked for Prosecution

Ext.1	Seizure list.
Ext.1/1	Signature of P.W.1 on Ext.1.
Ext.1/2	Signature of the accused.
Ext.1/3	Signature of P.W.3 on Ext.1.

Ext. 1/4 Signature of P.W.4 on Ext.1.
Ext. 1/5 Signature of P.W.6 on Ext.1
Ext.2 Seizure list.
Ext.2/1 Signature of P.W.1 on Ext.2.
Ext.2/2 Signature of P.W.6 on Ext.2.
Ext.3 Spot map.
Ext.3/1 Signature of P.W.6 on Ext.3.

List of Exhibits marked for defence.

Nil.

List of MOs marked for Prosecution.

Nil

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Banpur

IN THE COURT OF JUDL. MAGISTRATE FIRST CLASS, BANPUR.

Present. : Miss Sarmistha Dash, LL.B.,
Judl. Magistrate First Class,
Banpur.

Date of argument :25.08.2014
Date of Judgment.:03.09.2014

G.R. No. 232/2007
T.R. No. 273/2007

State	Prosecution
	-Versus	
Sathia @ Sasti Prasad Palei, aged about 39 years, S/o Ekadasi Palei. Vill: Baulabandha Raghunathpur Sasan, P.S: Banpur, Dist: Khurda.	Accused.

Offence:Under Section 47(a) of the B & O Excise Act, 1915.

For the Prosecution. : Sri J.Pradhan, APP.

For the Defence. : Sri B.K.Muduli & others.

J U D G M E N T.

01. The accused stands charged for the offence punishable Under Sections 47(a) of Bihar and Orissa Excise Act.

02. The case of the prosecution in brief runs thus:

One Subash Chandra Mishra S.I of police Nachuni O.P on 11.08.2007 at about 6.30pm he along with other police staffs performing patrolling duty at Baulabandha found the accused was illegally selling country spirit in his cabin shop. On search they found that the accused was possessed 51 packets of country spirit liquor each containing 200ml. On demand he failed to show any license or authority for such

possession and selling of liquor. After due verification he brought the accused along with the liquor to the P.S.

Upon such report P.S. Case No.144/2012 was registered and investigation was carried out and after completion of investigation as prima facie evidence is well made out against the accused, the I.O. submitted charge sheet against him. Hence this trial.

03. The plea of defence is one of complete denial and false implication.

04. The point for determination in this case emerges as follows:

(a) Whether on 11.08.2007 at 6.30pm 51 packets of country spirit was seized from the conscious and exclusive possession of the accused?

(b) Whether the seized liquor was nothing but C.S. liquor?

05. In order to prove its case, prosecution has examined as many as three P.Ws in its favour where as defence has examined none. All are independent witnesses to the occurrence.

06. In order to prove a case U/s 47(a) Bihar and Orissa Excise Act, it is for the prosecution to prove not only the fact of seizure from the exclusive and conscious possession of the accused but also the seized articles to be nothing but C.S liquor.

07. This is a case U/s 47(a) Bihar and Orissa Excise Act. In order to substantiate the case against the accused, it is necessary to scrutinize the case of prosecution. During course of the trial P.Ws 1,2 & 3 deposed that nothing has been seized in their presence by the police. This much of the evidence adduced by the prosecution. During course of examination of P.W.1 the Learned A.P.P also put leading question to the

said witness u/s 154 Evidence Act. but no material was brought out which could have supported the case of the prosecution

The witnesses to the seizure list did not support the fact of seizure of liquor from the possession of the accused in their presence. The prosecution has not been examined the informant who seized the liquor in this case. Further the seized articles were not produced before this court for its perusal. Hence, there is no proof in the record to prove that the seized liquids were nothing but the C.S. liquor. Further the fact of seizure from the conscious and exclusive possession of the accused is also not proved as none of the independent witnesses have corroborated the prosecution version. Hence in view of the above contradictions and due to lack of independent corroboration and in absence of any test, I am of the opinion that the prosecution has failed to prove its case against the accused beyond all reasonable doubts.

07. In the result, the accused is found not guilty for the offence U/s.47 (a) of Bihar and Orissa Excise Act, 1915 and acquitted thereof U/s.248 (1) of Cr.P.C. He be set at liberty and discharged from his bail bond.

The seized materials, if any be destroyed after four months of the appeal period, if no appeal is preferred and if preferred be dealt as per the order of the appellate court.

Enter the case as mistake of fact.

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Banpur

This judgment typed to my dictation, corrected by me and pronounced in the open court, given under my hand and seal of this court, this the 3rd day of September,2014.

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Banpur.

List of witnesses examined for Prosecution.

PW.1 Babu Maharana
PW.2 Nageswar Acharya
P.W.3 Prasanna Naik

List of witnesses examined for defence.

None.

List of Exhibits marked for Prosecution.

Ext.1 Signature of P.W.2 on the seizure list.
Ext.1/1 Signature of P.W.3 on the seizure list.

List of Exhibits marked for defence.

Nil.

List of MOs marked for Prosecution.

Nil

Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Banpur.