Sr. No. 71

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
AT JAMMU

LPA No. 211/2026

Date of pronouncement: 30.09.2026
Date of uploading: 01.10.2026

Satvir Singh Raina, Age 61 years
S/o Sh. Daya Singh
R/o H.No. 409, Sector F Sainik Colony, Jammu .....Applicant(s)/Appellant(s)

Through :- Ms. Shivani Jalali, Sr. Advocate with
Mr. Neeraj Sharma, Advocate

v/s

1. **Union of India through its Secretary, Ministry of Personal, Public Grievances and Pensions, Government of India, New Delhi.**
2. **Director Central Bureau of Investigation (CBI), Plot No. 5 B CGO Complex, Lodhi Road, New Delhi 110003.**
3. **Superintendent of Police, Central Bureau of Investigation, Special Cell Anti Corruption Bureau (ACB), Panama Chowk Railway Head Chowk, Jammu Tawi, J&K** .....Respondent(s)

Through :- Ms. Monika Kohli, Sr.AAG with
Ms. Mandeep Kour, Advocate

CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SANJEEV KUMAR, JUDGE
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE YASH PAUL BOURNEY, JUDGE

ORDER
30.09.2026

1. Impugned in this intra court appeal, preferred by the appellant under Clause 12 of Letters Patent, 1975, is an order and judgment dated 27.08.2026 passed by learned Single Bench of this Court in WP(C) No. 2682/2026, titled "Satvir Singh Raina v/s Union of India and others", whereby the writ petition filed by the appellant for seeking compensation, interest and cost, on account of some delay in refunding amount of ₹ 10 lakh, has been dismissed.

2. The case set up by the appellant in writ petition is that an amount of ₹ 10 lakh, which was used in a trap case as trap money, was, without good reasons, withheld by the CBI and, therefore, the CBI is liable to compensate the appellant by payment of compensation along with interest and costs, etc.

3. Admittedly, the amount of ₹ 10 lakh, upon which the interest is claimed by the appellant, was used as trap money in connection with FIR/RC No. RC0042023A0008 registered by the CBI/ACB, Jammu, on a complaint filed by the appellant. The currency notes worth ₹ 10 lakh were used as trap money and, therefore, formed part of the evidence in the investigation and was a piece of evidence for prosecution. The said amount, however, came to be refunded to the appellant by the trial Court in terms of Order dated 08.04.2026. The release of the trap amount which forms the part of the evidence or prosecution was objected by the CBI by filing an application.

4. The aforesaid application was considered by the trial Court. Vide Order dated 23.07.2026, the application made by the CBI was rejected and the I.O was directed to immediately handover ₹ 10 lakh to the appellant in exchange of the amount paid by him, during the trap against proper receipt. The Order dated 23.07.2026, was complied with by the CBI and an amount of ₹ 10 lakh in exchange of the amount used in the trap was paid to the appellant on 01.08.2026 i.e. within a week's time. We, therefore, fail to understand, as to how the appellant could lay a claim for compensation, interest and costs when the amount was released by the CBI in compliance with the order passed by the trial Court without any waste of time.

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH
सत्यमेव जयते

5. The appellant was not entitled to the release of amount till it was so directed by the trial Court on 08.04.2026. The CBI had every right to oppose such release and make a request in this regard before the trial Court. This is exactly what has been done by the CBI. However, the application filed by the CBI was not accepted by the trial Court and in terms of Order dated 23.07.2026, the I.O was directed to release the amount immediately and without any further waste of time. The CBI complied with the order within a week's time.

6. It is, thus, not the case, where the amount can be said to have been withheld by the CBI unauthorizedly or illegally or with any malafide intention or for ulterior consideration. The amount was seized in accordance with law and same was released also in accordance with law.

7. It is purely in consonance with law that the money which was used as 'trap money' remained with the investigating agency for some time.

8. In view of the aforesaid discussion, we do not find any legal infirmity or factual error in the judgment rendered by the writ Court. This appeal is, therefore, found devoid of any merit and the same is, accordingly, dismissed.

(Yash Paul Bourney)
Judge

(Sanjeev Kumar)
Judge

JAMMU
30.09.2026
Sapna

Whether this order is speaking: Yes/No

Whether this order is reportable: Yes/No

HIGH COURT OF JAMMU & KASHMIR AND LADAKH