



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 140 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.02.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

CRL RC No.140 of 2026

Thangarasu

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1.State represented by
Forest Ranger
Forest Range Office,
Vedaranyam,
Nagapattinam District
WLOR No.01/2025
U/s. 9, 27, 31, 32, 39, 50 a,b,c and
51(1A), (1B) of Wild Life Protection Act

2.Manikandan

(R2 is impleaded as per the order of this
Court dated 13.02.2026 in Crl.M.P.No.2474 of
2026 in Crl.R.C.No.140 of 2026)

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Revision Petition filed under Sections 442 of BNSS, praying to call for the records and set aside the order dated 20.11.2025 passed by the learned District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Vedaranyam in Crl.M.P.No.427 of 2025 in WLOR No.1 of 2025 and to return the vehicle Bajaj Discover bearing Registration No.TN-49-BX-1239, Model 2016, Colour Black Red, Chassis No.MD2A15BZXGWK00749, Engine No.JZZWKGK31404 to the custody of the petitioner.



WEB COPY



For Petitioner(s):

Mr.N.Palanivel

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Vinothraja

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The present Criminal Revision has been filed by the petitioner who claims ownership of the vehicle in question, challenging the order passed by the learned Magistrate dismissing the petition filed by him seeking interim custody of the vehicle.

2. The petitioner's vehicle was seized during the course of investigation in WLOR No.01/2025 registered under Sections 9, 27, 31, 32, 39, 50 a,b,c and 51(1A), (1B) of the Wild Life Protection Act.

3. It is the case of the petitioner that the second respondent herein had used the vehicle belonging to the petitioner allegedly for hunting a spotted deer, which is a scheduled wildlife species, and therefore the vehicle was seized.



WEB COPY

4. The petitioner filed an application before the Trial Court seeking interim custody of the vehicle on the ground that he is not an accused; that the vehicle belongs to him; and that his vehicle was used by the second respondent. The learned Magistrate, after considering the materials available on record, dismissed the said petition by the impugned order dated 20.11.2025.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that though the Registration Certificate of the vehicle stands in the name of the second respondent, the petitioner had purchased the said vehicle from him on 14.08.2025; that before the transfer of ownership could be effected, the seizure was made; and that the petitioner has valid documents namely, the transfer form and the receipt issued by the second respondent for transfer of the ownership.

6. It is seen from the records that the Registration Certificate of the vehicle stands in the name of the second respondent. As long as the registered owner of the vehicle continues to be the second respondent, the property cannot be ordered to be released to the petitioner. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is at liberty to take necessary steps to effect the transfer of ownership in accordance with law and thereafter, file an appropriate application for return of the property before the Trial Court.



7. With the above observations, this Criminal Revision Case stands disposed of.

WEB COPY

24.02.2026

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

To

1.The District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Vedaranyam

2. The Forest Ranger
Forest Range Office,
Vedaranyam,
Nagapattinam District

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 140 of 2



SUNDER MOHAN J.

Anu

CRL RC No.140 of 2026

24.02.2026