



Crl.R.C.No.250 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.03.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.R.C.No.250 of 2024

Ravikiran N

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Thally Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
Crime No.360 of 2023

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition filed under Sections 397 and 401 of Criminal Procedure Code, to set aside the order in Crl.M.P.No.4799 of 2023 dated 11.01.2024 passed by the Hon'ble Principal District and Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Radha Pandian

For Respondent : Mr.R.Kishore Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



Crl.R.C.No.250 of 2024

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, owner of the Tipper Lorry bearing registration No.KA-51-AB-6070 filed a petition seeking return of property before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri in Crl.M.P.No.4799 of 2023. The Trial Court by order dated 11.01.2024 dismissed the same. Against which, the present revision petition is filed.

2.The contention of the petitioner is that the petitioner is the owner of the vehicle i.e., Tipper Lorry bearing registration No.KA-51-AB-6070. The respondent police registered a case against the petitioner under Section 379 of IPC in connection with Crime No.360 of 2023 on 27.11.2023. He further submitted that the vehicle is kept in open space exposing to vagaries of weather, further detention would make the vehicle unusable, rusted and it would become a scrap. The petitioner is ready to comply with any condition that this Court may impose while granting return of vehicle. He would further submit that due to detention of vehicle, he is unable to continue his routine work and greatly impaired. Hence, he prays for return of property.



3.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent Police on the other hand submitted that on 27.11.2023 at about 3.00 a.m., the Sub-Inspector of Police attached to respondent police along with the police team went on patrol duty, at that time near the Kembathupalli bus stand, found a Tipper Lorry bearing registration No.KA-51-AB-6070 transporting 4 units of river sand illegally, on seeing the police, the petitioner abandoned the vehicle and ran away. On enquiry, it was found that the vehicle is owned by the petitioner and he is using the vehicle for collecting sand illegally and selling the same at higher rate. Hence, the vehicle was seized. He further submitted that the if the vehicle is handed over to the petitioner, he would indulge in similar offences. Further, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) made his objections based on the orders passed by this Court in Rev.Appl.Writ(MD).Nos.80 to 82 of 2019, W.P(MD).No.19936 of 2017, W.P(MD).Nos.7595 and 21485 of 2018, W.P(MD).No.14341 of 2022 and Crl.RC.(MD).No.470 of 2023. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of the revision petition.

4.This Court in ***Crl.O.P.No.646 of 2024 batch dated 29.01.2024 [Annadurai vs. The Inspector of Police, Kurisilapet Police Station, Thirupathur District]***, considered the objections and referring to the



orders of the Single Judge, Division Bench and Full Bench of this Court and the decisions of the Apex Court, yielding to the command of the Hon'ble Supreme Court under Article 141 of the Constitution of India, has held as follows:

“30. In view of the aforesaid discussion, the legal position can be summarised as under:

(a) The power to initiate confiscation proceedings and issue directions for release/disposal of the property under Section 21(4-A) of the MMDR Act, 1957 lies with the Court and not with any other authority;

(b) Section 21(4-A) expressly states that the Court competent to initiate confiscation proceedings and issue directions for the disposal of the seized material is the court competent to take cognizance of the offence under Section 21(1) of the Act;

*(c) The Special Court constituted under Section 30-B of the MMDR Act, 1957 is invested with the powers of a Court of Session under Section 30-C. Consequently, the Special Court being a Court of Session cannot directly take cognizance of an offence under the Act in view of the bar contained in Section 193 Cr.P.C and in the light of the law laid down in paragraph 38 of the decision in **Pradeep S. Wodeyar v. State of Karnataka, (2021) 19 SCC 62;***

(d) As a consequence, a complaint under Section 21 of the MMDR Act, 1957 can be filed only before the jurisdictional Magistrate empowered to take cognizance of the offence



(State (NCT of Delhi) v. Sanjay, (2014) 9 SCC 772, Kanwar Pal Singh v. State of U.P., (2020) 14 SCC 331 and Jayant v. State of M.P., (2021) 2 SCC 670), and not before the Special Court;

(e) Ex-consequenti, the Court for the purposes of Section 21(4-A) is the Court of the Magistrate since it is that Court which is empowered to take cognizance of the offences under Section 21(1). Hence, an application for release of vehicle will lie only before the jurisdictional Magistrate;

(f) The decisions of this Court in Muthu v District Collector (2018 SCC Online Mad 13985), the order passed in review dated 09.09.2019, the decision of the Full Bench in S. Kumar v District Collector (2023) 3 MLJ (Cri) 536 and that of the learned single judge Ramar v The State (Cr R.C MD 470 of 2023) dated 11.10.2023, to the extent that it is inconsistent with the decisions of the Supreme Court in State (NCT of Delhi) v. Sanjay, (2014) 9 SCC 772, Kanwar Pal Singh v. State of U.P., (2020) 14 SCC 331 and Jayant v. State of M.P., (2021) 2 SCC 670 and paragraph 38 of the decision in Pradeep S. Wodeyar v. State of Karnataka, (2021) 19 SCC 62, as discussed above, do not lay down the correct law.”

5. In view of the above, this Court finds that the vehicle is kept in open space exposing to vagaries of weather get rusted and the value of the vehicle get diminished. Hence, this Court is inclined to return the



vehicle to the petitioner. The respondent police is directed to return the vehicle, viz., Tipper Lorry bearing registration No.KA-51-AB-6070 to the petitioner on the following conditions:

(i) The petitioner shall deposit a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- (Rupees One Lakh Fifty Thousand only) before the jurisdictional Tahsildar as non-refundable deposit. After receipt of the above said amount, the same will have to be deposited by the Tahsildar, to the credit of the District Mines and Minerals Foundation Trust, Krishnagiri as non- refundable deposit;

(ii) The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- [Rupees Ten Thousand only] with two sureties each, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri. The petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and give the copies of their Aadhaar Card;

(iii) The petitioner shall give an undertaking before the respondent/ authority concerned stating that he will not use the vehicle in question for any illegal activities in future and shall produce the same as and when required by the respondent and also the trial Court, failing which the respondent/trial Court is at liberty to confiscate the vehicle;



Crl.R.C.No.250 of 2024

(iv) The petitioner shall not alienate the vehicle in question till the disposal of the proceedings before the authority concerned;

(v) The petitioner shall take photograph of the vehicle and submit the same along with Compact Disc duly certified under Section 65-B of the Indian Evidence Act, 1872;

(vi) The petitioner is also directed to participate in the enquiry to be conducted by the respondent.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Petition stands allowed and the impugned order dated 11.01.2024 passed by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Krishnagiri, in Crl.M.P.No.4799 of 2023 is set aside.

22.03.2024

Index : Yes/No

Speaking Order/Non Speaking Order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rpl

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Thally Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.
2. The Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Krishnagiri.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.250 of 2024

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

rpl

Crl.R.C.No.250 of 2024

22.03.2024