



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
BENCH AT AURANGABAD

CRIMINAL WRIT PETITION NO. 1013 OF 2025

Vijay Trimbak Salve

Age: 34 years, Occu.: Private Job,
R/o c/o Trinbak Salve 8/28/819,
Wankhede Nagar, Aurangabad
Now R/o A 102, Kaka Nano Homes,
Tukaram Nadhe Nagar, Kalewadi,
Pune, Tq. & Dist. Pune

..PETITIONER

VERSUS

State of Maharashtra
Through Police Inspector,
Kranti Chown Police Station,
Tq. & Dist. Chha. Sambhajinagar

..RESPONDENT

....
Mr. S.G. Jadhavar, Advocate for the petitioner
Mr. D.B. Bhange, A.P.P. for the respondent
....

CORAM : ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.
DATE : 15th DECEMBER, 2025

ORAL JUDGMENT :

1. Heard. **Rule.** Rule is made returnable forthwith and heard finally with the consent of learned counsel for the parties at the admission stage.
2. By this petition, the petitioner is challenging the order dated 03rd July, 2025, passed by the learned Special Judge and Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad, below exh. 1, in Crim. Misc. Application No. 108 of 2025.

3. Having heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned A.P.P. as well as the Investigating Officer, who is present in the Court, at the outset, it appears that the learned Additional Sessions Judge has rejected the application to release the laptop, on the ground that the offence is a serious one and huge public money is involved and also the investigation is incomplete. However, before this court learned of this, A.P.P. and the Investigating Officer submitted that the investigation had been completed, that the data from the said laptop had already been collected, and that they had no objection to returning the laptop to the petitioner on certain conditions. It appears from a copy of the bill for the purchase of the said laptop and the seizure panchanama that the petitioner is the owner of the said laptop. It also appears that the Investigating Officer has collected all data from the said laptop, that the investigation is complete, and that a charge sheet has been filed in Court.

4. In view of the above, in my opinion, if the laptop is returned to the petitioner, it would not cause any prejudice to the prosecution. Hence, I deem it appropriate to allow the petition. As a result, I pass the following order :-

- (a) Petition is allowed under the following conditions.
- (I) The Police Station Officer, Kranti Chowk Police Station, is directed to hand over interim custody of the seized laptop to the petitioner on executing a *supurtnama/ Security bond of Rs. 1,00,000/-* (Rupees one lakh) after due verification and identification.

- (II) Police Station Officer, Kranti Chowk Police Station, is directed to get soft and hard copies of the data containing the laptop memory in the presence of panchas for producing them in the court, if required.
- (III) Police Station Officer, Kranti Chowk Police Station shall collect the requisite certificate u/sec. 65-B of the Evidence Act from the person who collects a soft copy of data from the laptop memory and files the same on record.
- (IV) Police Station officer, Kranti Chowk Police Station, is further directed to take photographs of the seized laptop in the presence of panchas and to file a detailed panchanama describing it, with the photographs and file the same on record.
- (V) Petitioner is directed not to sell or make any changes or alterations to the seized laptop and produce it as and when called.
- (VI) Execute the *supurtnama*/Bond before the court/Police Station Officer, Kranti Chowk Police Station, who shall file the *supurtnama* bond and photographs before the court.
- (b) Rule is made absolute in the above terms.
- (c) Inform the order to the learned Additional Sessions Judge, Aurangabad.

(ABHAY J. MANTRI, J.)