



Crl.R.C.No.327 of 2023

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.02.2023

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE V. SIVAGNANAM

CRL.R.C.NO.327 OF 2023

M. Meganathan

.. Petitioner

Vs

The State, represented by the
Inspector of Police,
Poolampatti Police Station,
Salem District
Crime No.83/2022)

... Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Revision Petition filed under section 397 r/w.401 Cr.P.C., to call for the records in C.M.P.No.1615 of 2022 dated 30.06.2022 on the file of the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Edappadi and set aside the same by allowing the criminal revision petition.

For Petitioner : Mr.R. Madhubala

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

ORDER

This Criminal Revision case has been filed challenging the order of dismissal dated 30.06.2022 passed by the District Munsif cum Judicial



Magistrate, Edappadi in C.M.P.No.1615 of 2022 filed under sections 451 and 457 of Cr.P.C. Seeking interim custody of the vehicle bearing Registration No.TN 22 CT 9400.

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 3 units of sand. A case was registered by the respondent under section 379 IPC on 22.04.2022 in Cr.No.83/2022. Pursuant to which, the vehicle bearing Regn.No.TN-22-CT-9400 was seized by the respondent police. 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.

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 there is no previous case against this petitioner and the vehicle is not involved in the similar type of case previously. There is no antecedent in this regard against this petitioner.

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.

6. On perusal of the records, the fact reveals that on 22.04.2022, when the respondent police was on duty and conducting raid near Poolampatti – Edappadi Road, Acharya Education Institute, they intercepted the petitioner's vehicle. On enquiry, they found 3 units of river sand was transported illegally in the vehicle. Immediately they seized the vehicle and registered a case for the



offence under section 379 IPC. The petitioner is the owner of the above said vehicle and he is not an accused in Crime No.83 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 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 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.



WEB COPY

9. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is allowed and the impugned order dated 30.06.2022 passed in Crl.M.P.No.1615 of 2022 by the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Edappadi is set aside. The respondent police is directed to return the vehicle Ashok Leyland Lorry bearing Registration No.TN 22 CT 9400 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.8 lakhs/-(Rupees eight lakhs only) before District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Edappadi.
- 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



Crl.R.C.No.327 of 2023

police.

WEB COPY

24.02.2023

msr

Index: yes/no

Internet:yes/no

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Poolampatti Police Station,
Salem District
2. The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Edappadi
3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

V. SIVAGNANAM, J.

msr



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.327 of 2023

Crl.R.C.No.327 of 2023

24.02.2023