



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
DATED: 01.10.2020
CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.R.SWAMINATHAN

WEB COPY

W.P.(MD)No.13538 of 2020

Prabhakaran

... Petitioner

Vs.

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

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

3.The Inspector of Police,
Peraiyur Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District
(Crime No.117 and 2020).

... Respondents

Prayer: Writ petition is filed under Article 226 of the Constitution of India, to issue a Writ of Mandamus, to direct the respondents, to release the petitioner's vehicle ie., Tipper Lorry bearing registration No.TN57 P 5437, seized by the third respondent dated 25.08.2020 on the basis of the petitioner's representation dated 30.08.2020.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Vishnuram

For Respondents : Mr.M.Rajarajan


Additional Government Pleader

ORDER

Heard the learned counsel on either side. By consent of both parties, this writ petition is taken up for final disposal at the admission stage itself.

2. The petition mentioned vehicles were 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 vehicles 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 vehicles.



4. The petitioner's counsel gives an undertaking that the petitioner will see to it that the vehicles are not involved in any other offences of similar nature. The vehicles will be produced before the authority or the Court concerned as and when required. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner states that the vehicles 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 vehicles 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 vehicles 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. The petitioner's counsel states that while obtaining anticipatory bail, the petitioner was directed to pay a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) and that he had complied with the said condition. Taking note of the same, I am inclined to show some indulgence while fixing the quantum.

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

- a) *The petitioner shall not alienate or encumber the vehicles in question till the proceedings are completed.*
- b) *The petitioner shall produce all the documents pertaining to the ownership of the seized vehicles.*
- c) *As and when the respondents call for the vehicles for enquiry, the petitioner has to produce the vehicles 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 vehicles forthwith without any delay. If this undertaking given by the petitioner is breached, the petitioner will not be entitled to interim release of the vehicles in future. The



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

Sd/-

Assistant Registrar (CSII)

// True Copy //

WEB COPY

/ /2020

Sub Assistant Registrar(CS)

pnn

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,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Peraiyur Police Station,
Ramanathapuram District

Copy to :

- 1.The Registrar (Judicial),
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.
- 2.The Officer Incharge
High Court Legal Services Committee,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

+1 CC to M/s.SPL GP(SR-19062[F] dated 05/10/2020)

W.P. (MD)No.13538 of 2020
01.10.2020

PM(CO)

KB(15.10.2020) 3P 7C