



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 06.08.2020

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P. (MD)No.8909 of 2020

WEB COPY

Pothiraja

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Assistant Director,
Mines and Minerals Department,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.The Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

PRAYER: Petition filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents to release the petitioner's new and unregistered Tractor bearing Engine No.3105ELU93A809262F20, Chassis No.BZCSS81265353, seized by the 3rd respondent police, by considering the petitioner's representation dated on 31.07.2020 within a time stipulated by this Court.

For Petitioner	: Mr.T.Veerakumar
For Respondents	: Mr.M.Rajarajan, Government Advocate.
	* * *

O R D E R

Heard the learned counsel on either side.

2. The petition mentioned vehicle was seized in connection with the alleged illegal transportation of sand.

3. The learned Government Advocate states that even though the criminal case has been registered, the vehicle in question is yet to be produced before the jurisdictional Court. The case is still under investigation. I am of the view that so long as the vehicle has not been produced before the Jurisdictional Court, the Writ Court will always have the power to direct for the release of



the vehicle.

4. The petitioner's counsel gives an undertaking that the petitioner will see to it that the vehicle is not involved in any other offences of similar nature. The vehicle will be produced before the authority or the Court concerned as and when required. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the vehicle will not be alienated.

5. The submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner is placed on record. If the undertaking given before this Court is breached, the benefit of this order will stand recalled and the vehicle in question will be taken back to custody and it will be released only after getting orders from this Court on such terms as this Court may deem it fit to impose.

6. Normally, this Court would impose payment of cost. But in this case, the vehicle was seized one year ago. The petitioner was put to sufficient loss. Therefore, I refrain from imposing cost in this case.

7. I am of the view that keeping the petition mentioned vehicle in the custody of the respondents is not going to serve any purpose. The Hon'ble Supreme Court in the decision reported in (2002) 10 SCC 283 (Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai and Others V. State of Gujarat) has held as follows:-

"17. In our view, whatever be the situation, it is of no use to keep such seized vehicles at the police stations for a long period. It is for the Magistrate to pass appropriate orders immediately by taking appropriate bond and guarantee as well as security for return of the said vehicles, if required at any point of time. This can be done pending hearing of applications for return of such vehicles.

8. Therefore, the respondents are directed to release the said vehicle subject to the following conditions:-

- a) *The petitioner shall not alienate or encumber the vehicle in question till the proceedings are completed.*
- b) *The petitioner shall produce all the documents pertaining to the ownership of the seized vehicle.*
- c) *As and when the respondents call for the vehicle for enquiry, the petitioner has to produce the vehicle in question and he shall cooperate with the enquiry to be conducted by the respondents.*

9. Upon completion of these formalities, the respondents shall release the vehicle forthwith without any delay. If this undertaking given by the petitioner is breached, the petitioner will not be entitled to interim release of the vehicle in future. The



Writ Petition is allowed accordingly. There shall be no order as to costs.

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (AS)

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

ias/dss

Note: In view of the present lock down owing to COVID-19 pandemic, a web copy of the order may be utilized for official purposes, but, ensuring that the copy of the order that is presented is the correct copy, shall be the responsibility of the advocate/litigant concerned.

To:

- 1.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 2.The Assistant Director,
Mines and Minerals Department,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Sayalkudi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

+1 CC to M/s.GP (SR-13841[F] dated 07/08/2020)

W.P. (MD)No.8909 of 2020

06.08.2020

KK(07.08.2020) 3P 5C