



WEB COPY

Crl.R.C.No.620 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.R.C.No.620 of 2026

Mr.Solomonraj,
S/o.Anthonysamy

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
CCB, FIW, Beta – 10A, Vepery, Chennai – 7.
Crime No.160/2025

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Revision Petition filed under Section 397 & 401 Cr.P.C. read with Section 438 read with 442 of Cr.P.C., to set aside the order dated 20.01.2026 passed in Crl.M.P.No.16630 of 2025 by the CCB (CBCID) Metropolitan Magistrate Court at Egmore, Chennai return of seized property, namely Vivo One Plus Nord CE- 5 Black Colour and Vivo Y20 Gold colour to the petitioner.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Maduraiveeran

For Respondent : Mr.R.Kishore Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

This Criminal Revision Petitioner has been filed to set aside the order dated 20.01.2026 passed in Crl.M.P.No.16630 of 2025 by the CCB (CBCID) Metropolitan Magistrate Court at Egmore, Chennai return of seized property, namely Vivo One Plus Nord CE- 5 Black Colour and Vivo Y20 Gold colour to the petitioner.

2. According to the petitioner, he had filed an application under Section 497 r/w.503 of BNSS in Crl.M.P.No.16630 of 2025 seeking release of the seized properties, namely a Vivo One Plus Nord CE- 5 Black Colour and Vivo Y20 Gold colour, in his favour. However, the learned Magistrate, has dismissed the said petition vide order dated 20.01.2026 stating that the matter warrants reconsideration. Aggrieved over the same, the present revision has been filed.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the said mobile phones absolutely belong to the petitioner. He further submits that the mobile phones are neither a material object directly linked to the offence nor required for further investigation. Hence, he prayed to set aside the impugned order.



4. The said contention was stoutly objected by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. On a perusal of the impugned order, it is clear that the learned Magistrate has observed that the whatsapp messages are required to be retrieved from the said phones and that the devices have been sent for forensic analysis. In view of such findings, this Court does not find any infirmity in the order passed by the learned Magistrate.

7. Accordingly, this criminal revision petition is dismissed.

12.03.2026

mp



WEB COPY

Crl.R.C.No.620 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

mp

To

- 1.The CCB (CBCID) Metropolitan Magistrate,
Egmore, Chennai
- 2.The Inspector of Police
CCB, FIW, Beta-10A, Vepery
Chennai-7.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.R.C.No.620 of 2026

12.03.2026