



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1915 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

CRL RC No. 1915 of 2025

1. Saranraj

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Maduraiveeran

2.The state of Tamil nadu rep by the Inspector of Police
Inspector of Police, Keelapalur Police Station, Ariyalur District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To call for the records relating to order dated 22.05.2025 passed in Crl.MP.No.304/2025 in Crime No. 44/2025 on the file of the JM No.II, Ariyalur and modify the same and imposed a condition to deposit the fine amount paid by the revision petitioner for granting custody of the vehicle to the Respondent / Accused to safeguard the petitioners recovery interest .

For Petitioner(s): A.V.Raja

For Respondent(s): Dr.C.E.Pratap,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petition has been filed challenging the order passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate No. II, Ariyalur, allowing the petition filed by the first respondent herein seeking interim custody of his vehicle, namely, an Ashok



Leyland lorry bearing Registration No. TN-57-AB-6886. The first respondent is an accused in Crime No.44 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 318(4) and 316(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

2. The gist of the allegation against the first respondent is that he was awarded a contract by the petitioner to supply coal to M/s. Chettinad Cement, Ariyalur and that, contrary to the terms of the contract, the first respondent supplied adulterated coal, causing loss to the petitioner, pursuant to which a complaint was lodged.

3. During the course of investigation, the second respondent seized the vehicle belonging to the first respondent. The first respondent thereafter sought return of the vehicle by filing a petition before the learned Magistrate in Crl.M.P.No.304 of 2025, which was allowed by the learned Magistrate.

4. It is the case of the petitioner that the learned Magistrate ought not to have released the vehicle to the first respondent, as the first respondent is liable to pay money to the petitioner for the loss suffered by him. The learned counsel for the petitioner therefore prayed for setting aside the impugned order.

5. Admittedly, the first respondent is the owner of the vehicle. The monetary dispute between the petitioner and the first respondent cannot be



adjudicated in a petition seeking return of a vehicle. The Trial Court has only handed over interim custody of the vehicle to the owner from whom it was seized. Hence, this Court finds no infirmity in the impugned order passed by the learned Magistrate.

SUNDER MOHAN J.
skr

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed.

18-12-2025

skr
Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

CRL RC No. 1915 of 2025

To

1. The Inspector of Police, Keelapalur Police Station, Ariyalur District.
2. Learned Judicial Magistrate No. II, Ariyalur,



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1915 of 2024



18-12-2025