



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.207/2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22.02.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. SIVAGNANAM

CRL.R.C.NO.207 OF 2023

Gopinath

.. Petitioner

Vs

The State, represented by the
Inspector of Police,
Pallavaram Police Station,
Chennai City.
(Crime No.810 /2022)
Respondent

...

Prayer: Criminal Revision Petition filed under section 397 r/w.401 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in Crl.M.P.No.5657 of 2022 dated 30.12.2022 on the file of the Principal Special Judge, Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai – 104 and set aside the same by allowing the criminal revision petition.

For Petitioner : - Mrs.G. Gayathri

For Respondent : Mr.V. Meganathan, GA (Crl.side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision case has been filed challenging the order of



Crl.R.C.No.207/2023

dismissal dated 30.12.2022 passed by the Principal Special Judge, Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai – 104 in Crl.M.P.No.5657 of 2022 filed under sections 451 and 457 of Cr.P.C. seeking interim custody of the vehicle viz., Bajaj Pulsar NS 200 bearing Registration No.TN-11 AZ 0977.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the petitioner is the owner of the vehicle seized by the respondent police for illegal transportation of 1300 numbers of narcotic substances viz., Nitrovet Tablets and 1700 numbers of Tydol Tablets concealed in the vehicle by A2. A case was registered by the respondent for the offence under section 8(c) r/w.22(b), 27(a) and 25 of NDPS Act on 11.10.2022 in Cr.No.810/2022. Pursuant to which, the vehicle bearing Regn.No.TN-11 AZ 0977 was seized by the respondent police and produced before the court below in B.No.456 of 2022 on 28.12.2022. He further submitted that the petitioner is not an accused in this case and he is nothing to do with the offence and the vehicle also not involved in similar type of any cases. In such circumstances, he seeks to grant interim custody of the vehicle to the petitioner.



Crl.R.C.No.207/2023

WEB COPY

3. Further, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that no purpose will be served in keeping the vehicle under the custody of respondent police and if the vehicle is kept for a long time in the open space, it would cause damage to the vehicle. The petitioner is ready to give appropriate guarantee as well as security for return of vehicle and also he will produce the vehicle, as and when required either before the respondent police or before the trial court. Hence, he prayed to return the vehicle and he is ready to obey any condition imposed on him by this Court.

4. The learned Government Advocate (crl.side) for the respondent objected to return the vehicle to the petitioner and submitted that the petitioner is not arrayed as accused in this case and there is no previous case against this petitioner and the vehicle is not involved in the similar type of case previously.

5. I have considered the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (crl.side) for the



respondent.

WEB COPY

6. On perusal of records, it is seen that the respondent police on 11.10.2022, on receiving secret information about the illegal transportation of Narcotic substance, went to Ink Thoppu, Pallavaram and conducted vehicle check up. While so, A1 to A5 came in two two wheelers bearing Regn.No.TN 11 AZ 0977 and TN 22 CV 3229. They intercepted both the vehicles and on search, they found and seized Nitrovet Tablet 1330 nos., Tydol 100 Mg – 1700 nos from their possession. Immediately they seized the above said two vehicles and registered a case under section 8(c) r/w.22(b), 27(a) and 25 of NDPS Act on 11.10.2022 in Cr.No.810/2022 against the accused persons. The petitioner is the owner of the vehicle bearing Regn.No.TN-11 AZ 0977 and he is not arrayed as an accused in Crime No.810 of 2022. Further the vehicle was not involved previously in similar type of offences.

7. Perusal of records would further reveal that the petitioner is only the owner of vehicle and he is not arrayed as accused in this case and the petitioner is ready to give guarantee and security for returning the vehicle. If the vehicle is being kept in an open space, it would cause damage to the vehicle and the



value of the vehicle is diminished and continuing to keep the vehicle in open air would make the vehicle unusable.

8. At this juncture, it is relevant to rely upon a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai and others Vs .State of Gujarat in Special Leave Petition (crl.) 2745 of 2022 dated 01.10.2002** and relevant portion of the decision cited above is extracted hereunder;

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.

*18. In case where the vehicle is not claimed by the accused, owner, or the insurance company or by third person, then such vehicle may be ordered to be auctioned by the Court. If the said vehicle is insured with the insurance company, then insurance company be informed by the Court to take possession of the vehicle, which is not claimed by the owner or a third person. If insurance Company fails to take possession the vehicles may be sold as per the direction of the Court. The Court would pass such order within a period of six months from the date of production of the said vehicle before the Court. **In any case, before handing over possession of such vehicles, appropriate photographs of the said vehicle should be taken and detailed panchanama should be prepared.***



Therefore, as per the ratio laid down by the Hon'ble Apex Court, this Court is of the view that keeping the vehicle idle in the open space, will diminish its nature and lose its value and no purpose will be served. As such, considering the nature of offence and also taking into account the fact that the vehicle is not involved in any other case similar in nature previously, this Court is inclined to allow the Criminal Revision Case.

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is allowed and the impugned order dated 30.12.2022 passed in Crl.M.P.No.5657 of 2022 by the Principal Special Judge under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai is set aside. The respondent police is directed to return the vehicle Bajaj Pulsar NS 200 bearing Registration No.TN-11 AZ 0977 to the owner of the vehicle on the following conditions;

- i. the petitioner shall prove his ownership of the vehicle by producing the R.C.Book and other relevant records;
- ii. the petitioner shall not alienate or encumber the vehicle in any manner;
- iii. the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.75,000/- (Rupees seventy five thousand only) before the Principal



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.207/2023

Special Judge, Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act, Chennai.

- iv.the petitioner shall give an undertaking that he will not use the vehicle for any illegal activities in future,
- v. the petitioner shall take photograph of the vehicle; and
- vi.the petitioner shall also produce the vehicle as and when required before the court below and before the respondent police.

22.02.2023

msr

Index: yes/no

Internet:yes/no

To

1. The Principal Special Judge,
Principal Special Court under EC & NDPS Act,
Chennai – 104.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Pallavaram Police Station,
Chennai City.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.207/2023

V. SIVAGNANAM, J.

msr

CRL.R.C.NO.207 OF 2023



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.207/2023

22.02.2023