

IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH

CRM-M-30428 of 2014 (O&M)
Date of Decision:- 29.07.2015.

M/s Chahal Retreads

.....Petitioner

Versus

State of Punjab

.....Respondent

CRM-M-30429 of 2014 (O&M)

Jagjit Singh Chahal

.....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 their vehicles. The plea 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.	Honda Accord (Honda)	PB-10CE-0001
2.	Terracan (Hyundai)	PB-10BW-0001

Learned State counsel says that since recovery was effected from these two vehicles, hence the same are case property. It is thus directed that let these two vehicles be released on furnishing Sapurdari bonds by the petitioner(s) to the satisfaction of Chief Judicial Magistrate, Mohali. A compliance affidavit be filed.

**(SURYA KANT)
JUDGE**

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

July 29, 2015.

sandeep sethi