

2025:PHHC:132437



**IN THE HIGH COURT FOR THE STATES OF PUNJAB AND
HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH**

293

**CRR-1705-2025 (O&M)
Date of decision: 23.09.2025**

Bhagwan Singh**...Petitioner**

Versus

State of Haryana**...Respondent****CORAM: HON'BLE MRS. JUSTICE MANISHA BATRA**

Present:- Mr. Satnam Singh Gill, Advocate
For the petitioner.

Mr. Neeraj Poswal, AAG, Haryana.

MANISHA BATRA, J. (Oral)

1. The instant revision petition has been filed by the petitioner against the order dated 01.06.2024, passed by learned Additional Sessions Judge, Jind in case arising out of FIR No. 397 dated 03.11.2022, registered under Sections 148, 149, 170, 279, 307, 336, 420, 427 and 337 of IPC and Section 25(1)(BA) of the Arms Act at Police Station Sadar Narwana, District Jind, whereby an application moved by the petitioner for release of the vehicle bearing registration number HR-19-G-5205 make Maruti Ritz had been dismissed.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the aforesaid vehicle had been taken into possession by the police on the ground that the same was used by the accused at the time of committing subject offences. The same is lying in the police station since long. The petitioner is the registered owner of the said vehicle. He had moved an application for release of the same in his favour but the learned trial Court had dismissed his

2025:PHHC:132437



application only on the ground that the registration certificate (RC) of the vehicle was involved in another case bearing FIR No. 434 of 2021, registered under Sections 379-B, 420 and 120-B of IPC at Police Station Sadar Pehowa.

Learned counsel for the petitioner further submits that the condition of the vehicle is deteriorating every passing day, besides it is getting rusty. Hence, it is urged that the petition deserves to be accepted, impugned order is liable to be set aside and the vehicle deserves to be released to the petitioner on *superdari*.

3. Learned State counsel, on the other hand, has opposed the prayer of the petitioner by arguing that there is no infirmity or illegality in the impugned order and the trial Court has rightly rejected the application of the petitioner seeking release of the aforesaid vehicle in his favour on *superdari* as the RC of the said vehicle was involved in one more case.

4. This Court has heard the submissions made by both the sides.

5. Admittedly, the petitioner is the registered owner of the aforesaid vehicle, which is lying in the possession of the police since long. A perusal of the impugned order reveals that the prayer of the petitioner had been rejected only on the ground that the RC of the vehicle was involved in one more case i.e. FIR No. 434. In the considered opinion of this Court, the reasoning given by the learned trial Court is not sustainable as in case the petitioner is not allowed to have the possession of the vehicle, its condition would worsen due to its non-utilization. Therefore, considering the fact that the petitioner is a registered owner of the vehicle and the condition of the vehicle must be

2025:PHHC:132437



deteriorating, it is found appropriate to release the same in favour of the petitioner on *superdari*.

6. Accordingly, the present petition is allowed. The impugned order is set aside. The vehicle bearing registration number HR-19-G-5205 make Maruti Ritz is ordered to be released in favour of the petitioner, subject to his furnishing *supardaginama*/surety bonds to the satisfaction of the learned trial Court and also on usual terms and conditions to be imposed by the learned trial Court. The petitioner shall also place on record a certified copy of the RC and shall give an undertaking that if the original RC is required in the other case, the same shall be placed on record by him.

23.09.2025*Waseem Ansari***(MANISHA BATRA)
JUDGE***Whether speaking/reasoned**Yes/No**Whether reportable**Yes/No*