



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.06.2024

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.DHANDAPANI

Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

Rengaiyan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Additional Superintendent of Police,
PEW, Office of the Additional Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvarur District.

2. The Sub Inspector of Police,
PEW, Nannilam Police Station,
Thiruvarur District.
(Crime No.596/2024)

... Respondents

Prayer : Criminal Revision Petition filed under Section 397 r/w. 401 of Criminal Procedure Code, to set aside the order, dated 05.06.2024 in Crl.M.P.No.1559 of 2024 passed by the learned District Munsif cum Magistrate, Nannilam and direct the second respondent herein to release the TATA's tipper lorry bearing Registration No.TN 46 AD 3010 seized on 24.05.2024 in connection with Crime No.596/2024 on the file of the second respondent to the petitioner.



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vignesh
For M/s.T.Muruganantham
For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The Criminal Revision is filed, challenging the order, dated 05.06.2024 passed in Crl.M.P.No.1559 of 2024 by the learned District Munsif cum Magistrate, Nannilam.

2. The revision petitioner filed a petition in Crl.M.P.No.1559 of 2024 under Sections 451 & 457 of Cr.P.C., seeking interim custody of the vehicle viz., TATA Motors (Tipper Taras 12 Wheeler) bearing Reg.No. TN 46 AD 3010. The said petition was dismissed by the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Nannilam on 05.06.2024. Aggrieved over the said order, the Criminal revision is preferred by the revision petitioner.

3. Mr.M.Vignesh, learned counsel for the petitioner contended



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

that the petitioner is the owner of the vehicle viz., Tata Motors bearing Reg.No. TN 46 AD 3010 and the said vehicle was seized by the Respondent Police on 24.05.2024 in Crime No.596/2024 for an alleged offence punishable under Sections 4(1)(a) TNP ACT. The said vehicle is kept in the custody of Police in open space in the Police Station. If the vehicle is kept in an open space, the value of the same will diminish over the period of time. Therefore he prayed for return of the vehicle.

4. Mr.A.Gopinath, learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) appearing for the respondents contended that the vehicle was used for illegal transportation of liquor bottle and if the vehicle is ordered to be returned, the petitioner may use the vehicle for committing similar offence. Hence, he sought for dismissal of the petition.

5. At this juncture, it is relevant to refer a decision of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *Sunderbhai Ambalal Desai and others Vs. State of Gujarat in Special Lave Petition (Crl.)2745 of 2022 dated 01.10.2002*, wherein, the relevant portion is extracted hereunder.



Vehicles

“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.

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.”

6. Considering the fact that keeping the vehicle idle in an open space, would diminish the value of the vehicle over a period of time and



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

considering the dictum laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court, this Court is inclined to allow the Revision Petition.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is allowed, the impugned order dated 20.03.2024 in Crl.M.P.No.1559 of 2024 passed by the learned District Munsif cum Magistrate, Nannilam, is set aside and the vehicle shall be returned to the petitioner on the following conditions:

- i. the petitioner shall prove her ownership of the vehicle by producing the R.C.Book and other relevant records;
- ii. the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- (Rupees eight Lakhs Only) before the trial Court.
- iii. the Court may prepare a panchanama in Judicial Form No.82 with regard to the vehicle bearing Registration No. TN 46 AD 3010 and such panchanama can be used in evidence.
- iv. the petitioner shall take photograph of the vehicle bearing Registration No.TN 46 AD 3010 and certified under Section 65B of the Central Act 1 of 1972 and such photographs may be used as secondary evidence.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

- v. the petitioner shall not alienate or encumber the vehicle in any manner;
- vi. the petitioner shall give an undertaking that he will not use the vehicle for any illegal activities in future,
- vii. the petitioner shall also produce the vehicle as and when required before the court below and before the respondent police.

18.06.2024

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-Speaking order
Rli



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

WEB COPY To

- 1.The District Munsif cum Magistrate, Nannilam.
2. The Additional Superintendent of Police,
PEW, Office of the Additional Superintendent of Police,
Thiruvarur District.
3. The Sub Inspector of Police,
PEW, Nannilam Police Station,
Thiruvarur District.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

M.DHANDAPANI, J.

rli

Crl.R.C.No.1013 of 2024

18.06.2024