

IN THE HIGH COURT OF ORISSA AT CUTTACK

CRLREV No.445 of 2021

Krushna Chandra Samal

Petitioner

....
Mr.P.Pattnaik, Advocate

-versus-

State of Odisha

Opposite Party

....
Mr. M.K. Mohanty, ASC

CORAM:

JUSTICE S.K. PANIGRAHI

ORDER

24.01.2022

Order No.

01.

1. The matter is taken up through video conferencing mode.
2. Heard learned counsel for the parties.
3. The petitioner has preferred this revision against the order dated 04.09.2021 passed by the learned J.M.F.C, Harabhanga in Misc. Case No.10 of 2021 arising out of 2(b)CC Case No.41 of 2021 whereby his petition for release of his furnitures and other household articles has been rejected.
3. The allegation against the petitioner is that a few finished products like stool, Cot and furniture made of teak wood were seized from the petitioner on the ground of non production of valid documents.
- 4.Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the articles were purchased from M/s Pradhan Carpentry Unit at a considerable amount for the purpose of his daughter's marriage.

But the same were seized by the Forest Officials of Boudh Division and a case vide 2(b) CC Case No.41 of 2021 was registered for the offences under Section 45 and 56 of Odisha Forest Act 1972 and under Rules 4, 12 and 21 of Odisha Timber Transit Rule 1980, on the ground that he was not in possession of any valid documents with respect to the seized articles. Hence, he had filed an application under Section 457 of the Cr.P.C. before the learned J.M.F.C., Harbhanga for the release of the said articles, which was rejected. Being aggrieved with such order, he has approached this Court by way of revision.

5. On perusal of the order of the court below and other connected documents, it is found that the petitioner has neither filed any supporting documents towards claiming of ownership of the seized articles nor filed any invoice of the same. The petitioner was given sufficient opportunities to produce the documents but he has failed to comply with the directions of the court.

6. In view of the above facts and circumstances, this court do not find any infirmities in the order of the court below.

7. Accordingly, the revision petition merits no consideration, stands dismissed.

8. As the restrictions due to resurgence of Covid-19 are continuing, learned counsel for the parties may utilize a print

out of the order available in the High Court's website, at par with certified copy, subject to attestation by the Advocate concerned with his/her seal, in the manner prescribed vide Court's Office Order dated 7th January, 2022.

(S.K. Panigrahi)
Judge

LB

