

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No. 151 of 2019**

Regina Revalo W/o Shri Julius Revelo, aged about 55 years R/o Village Rajkhedi, near Gram Panchayat P.S. Padmakar Nagar, Tah. & Distt. Sagar, Civil and Revenue Distt. Sagar (M.P.)

----Applicant**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh through Police Station Dongaripali, Tah. Baramkela, Distt. Raigarh (C.G.).

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Mr. Manoj Kumar Sinha, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Mr. Alok Nigam, Govt. Advocate

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order on Board

20/02/2019

1. By way of present Criminal Revision filed under Section 397 read with 401 of Cr.P.C., the Applicant has challenged order dated 10/01/2019 passed by the Special Judge (NDPS), Raigarh in Criminal Case No, 02/2019 whereby the application of the Applicant for releasing vehicle on Supurdnama was rejected.
2. As per prosecution story, on 20/11/2017 on the basis of information received from the informant, the police party stopped one Hyundai Axcent which was fixing number plate of CG04 V 4783. On being searched total 70 kg of contraband (Ganja) was seized from the said vehicle. It was the case of the prosecution that the driver of the said vehicle fled away from the spot. While checking the vehicle documents, it was found that the registration No. of vehicle was MP15 CB 3633. The vehicle was seized. The Applicant, being owner of vehicle, made an application for releasing the vehicle on Supurdnama which was rejected by the learned trial Court.

Thus, this revision.

3. Learned counsel for the Applicant submits that the Applicant is registered owner of the vehicle which was alleged to be involved in commission of crime. He further submits that accused Sourabh Soni was the driver of the vehicle. On 16/11/2017 accused Sourabh told the Applicant that he is going to Indore for booking and when he did not return, then a missing report of the vehicle was lodged by the Applicant. There is no involvement of the Applicant in crime in question. The seized vehicle of which the Applicant is registered owner is lying idle in the police station since 20/11/2017 and no fruitful purpose would be served if the vehicle remains idle in the custody of the police personnels exposed to the extreme weather conditions. The vehicle would get decayed day by day and would further deteriorate by passage of time to the extent that it would become unusable after some time and therefore in the interest of justice the vehicle may be released.
4. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the State opposes the claim of the Applicant.
5. I have heard learned counsel for the parties and perused the material available on record.
6. Considering the fact that the Applicant is the registered owner of the seized vehicle and also taking note of the fact that no useful purpose would be served if the seized vehicle is allowed to get exposed in the extreme weather conditions at the police station. On the contrary, if the vehicle can be released to the Applicant subject to certain conditions he can use it so that the vehicle does not become junk after some time.

7. For the foregoing reasons, the impugned order rejecting the application for releasing of the seized vehicle on Supurdnama is not proper and the same is set-aside.
8. It is directed that the seized vehicle belonging to the Applicant i.e. Hyundai Axcent registration No. MP15 CB 3633 be released to the Applicant upon his furnishing a personal bond of Rs.10,00,000/- with one surety of the like amount to the satisfaction of the concerned Court below for return of the said vehicle, if required at any point of time. In the bond he shall give an undertaking that he shall not change the ownership of the vehicle nor shall he change colour of the vehicle neither shall he create a third party right or interest over the said vehicle. He shall also undertake that he shall produce the vehicle as and when required by the prosecution during course of investigation, trial and even at the appellate state. He shall further undertake to produce the vehicle to any competent authority under different statutes as and when required. So far as surety is concerned, it shall be equal to the present day value of the vehicle seized or to the satisfaction of the concerned Trial Court.
9. With the aforesaid observations, the Criminal Revision is allowed.

Sd/-
(Arvind Singh Chandel)
Judge