

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-28445 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 29.07.2015.

M/s New Piya Roadways Pvt. Limited

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CRM-M-28457 of 2014 (O&M)

M/s Montek Biopharma

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE SURYA KANT
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE P.B. BAJANTHRI**

- 1. Whether Reporters of local papers may be allowed to see the judgment?**
- 2. To be referred to the Reporters or not?**
- 3. Whether the judgment should be reported in the Digest?**

Present: Mr. Vikram Chaudhri, Senior Advocate with
Ms. Isha Goyal, Advocate and
Mr. Harshit Sethi, Advocate for the petitioner.

Mr. Vaibhav Sharma, DAG, Punjab.

SURYA KANT, J. (ORAL)

The petitioner(s) in these two petitions have questioned
the seizure of its vehicles and/or owned by the partner/Director of the

Firm/Company. The ground taken is that the Competent Authority under Section 68 (F) (2) of the NDPS Act, 1985 has not confirmed the seizure of following vehicles:-

Sr. No.	Type of Vehicle	Registration No.
1.	Bolero Jeep (Mahindra)	PB-02BL-1000
2.	Bolero Jeep (Mahindra)	PB-02-BL-0002
3.	Max Jeep (Mahindra)	PB-02-BQ-9330

It is the conceded position that none of the three vehicles referred to above are case properties also. There is thus no legal impediment against the release of these vehicles. It is directed that no sooner the original owner, Partner or Director of the Company submits a formal written request, these three vehicles be released forthwith and a compliance affidavit be filed.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

**(P.B. BAJANTHRI)
JUDGE**

July 29, 2015.
sandeep sethi