

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH, BILASPUR**Criminal Revision No. 1336 of 2018**

Shraddha Kashyap, Aged about 24 years D/o. Ravinandan Kashyap, R/o 41, Shanti Parra, Chatona, P.S. Jarhagaon, District Mungeli (C.G.)

----Applicant**Versus**

State of Chhattisgarh Through Station House Officer, Sarkanda, District Bilaspur (C.G.).

---- Respondent

For Applicant	:	Ms. Shivali Dubey, Advocate
For Respondent	:	Ms. Smita Ghai, PL

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Singh Chandel
Order on Board

18/02/2019

1. By way of present Criminal Revision filed under Section 397 read with 401 of Cr.P.C., the Applicant has challenged order dated 04/10/2018 passed by the Special Judge (NDPS), Bilaspur in Crime No. 756/2018, Police Station Sarkanda, Bilaspur, whereby the application of the Applicant for releasing vehicle on Supurdnama was rejected.
2. As per prosecution story, the Applicant is owner of the vehicle bearing registration No. CG28 HP 0656 (Scooty). It is alleged that at the relevant time, accused persons was carrying prohibited drugs in the said Scooty. 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. She further submits that the Applicant was not within knowledge

that the accused persons were carrying Ganja in the said vehicle. She further submits the seized vehicle of which the Applicant is registered owner is lying idle in the police station since 18/09/2018 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. Scooty bearing registration No. CG28 HP 0656 be released to the Applicant upon his furnishing a personal bond of Rs.50,000/- 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