



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 17.09.2020

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

W.P. (MD)No.11877 of 2020

Ashok Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.The Assistant Director of Geology and Mining,
Ramanathapuram District.

2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram District.

3.The Special Inspector of Police,
Perunazhi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ Petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, directing the respondents to release the Tipper Lorry bearing Registration No.TN 96 C 3133, from the respondent's custody.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Manikandan


For Respondents : Mr.M.Rajarajan
Additional Government Pleader

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 Additional Government Pleader 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. The learned counsel further states that the vehicle was in the custody of the respondent for 11 months.

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. 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."

7. As I have considered the submission made by the petitioner's counsel that the vehicle was in the custody of the respondents for 11 months, I refrain to impose any cost. 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.*

8. 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

WEB COPY

// True Copy //

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

vrn

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 Assistant Director of Geology and Mining,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 2.The Revenue Divisional Officer,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Special Inspector of Police,
Perunazhi Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District.

+1 CC to M/s.GP (SR-17456[F] dated 18/09/2020)

W.P. (MD) No.11877 of 2020

17.09.2020

SCR(CO)

AP(24/09/2020) 3P 5C