



\$~47

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**

+ **W.P.(C) 1556/2025 & CM APPL. 9111/2025**

KALEEM KHAN

.....Petitioner

Through: **Mr. Pritish Sabharwal, Ms. Shweta Singh, Advocates (M: 9871878690)**

versus

GOVT OF NCT OF DELHI & ORS.

.....Respondents

Through: **Ms. Tulika Kamra Adv on behalf of Ms. Astha Gupta Adv. for Respondent No 1. Mr. Ashish Dixit, CGSC with Ms. Shubhra Parashar, Sr. Panel Counsel for R-2/SHO-Jamia & SHO-Okhla (M:9891220689)**

CORAM:

HON'BLE MS. JUSTICE MINI PUSHKARNA

ORDER

02.04.2025

%

1. The present petition has been filed seeking directions to the respondents to release the seized vintage cars/vehicles of the petitioner, *vide* the Seizure Memo dated 21st December, 2024.

2. This Court notes that when the matter was listed on 18th March, 2025, it has been recorded, as follows:

“xxx xxx xxx

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that four cars of the petitioner had been impounded by the respondents. Two of them were vintage cars, which are subject matter of the present writ petition. He further submits that the two other cars had also been impounded by the respondents, totaling to four.

3. *Per contra, learned counsel appearing for the respondents submits that only two cars in total had been seized by the*



respondents. She submits that the seizure memos, which are now being relied upon by the petitioner, are forged and fabricated documents.

4. In response, learned counsel appearing for the petitioner disputes the fact that the seizure memos relied upon by the petitioner are forged and fabricated.

5. She further submits that a reply has been filed in regard thereto, wherein, these facts have categorically been stated.

xxx xxx xxx”

(Emphasis Supplied)

3. Perusal of the aforesaid order shows that it is the clear stand of the respondents, that only two cars in total, had been seized by the respondents and not four cars, as contended by the petitioner. Further, it is the clear case of the respondents that the Seizure Memos, which are being relied upon by the petitioner, are forged and fabricated documents.

4. Pursuant to the order passed by this Court, learned counsel for SHO, Police Station-Okhla, who has wrongly been impleaded as SHO, Jamia Nagar by the petitioner, has put in appearance before this Court. He reiterates the position that only two cars were impounded by the department.

5. Learned counsel appearing for respondent no. 2- SHO, Police Station-Okhla, upon instructions, clearly states that only two cars were impounded by the department.

6. He further submits that the two cars impounded by the department, were not the cars, which are subject matter of the present petition.

7. Clearly, disputed questions of facts have been raised in the present petition, which cannot be decided in the present proceedings.

8. Thus, considering the aforesaid, the petitioner is directed to seek appropriate legal remedies.



9. This Court also takes note of the fact that *vide* order dated 07th February, 2025, this Court had directed that the vehicles in question, will not be scrapped till the next date of hearing.

10. Accordingly, it is directed that the vehicles of the petitioner that were impounded by the respondents shall not be scrapped, during the pendency of the proceedings, to be initiated by the petitioner, herein.

11. It is clarified that this Court has not expressed any opinion on the merits of the case. Rights and contentions of both the parties are left open.

12. The next date of hearing of 07th May, 2025, stands cancelled.

13. With the aforesaid directions, the present petition, along with the pending applications, is disposed of.

MINI PUSHKARNA, J

APRIL 2, 2025/au