



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 398 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.RC No. 398 of 2026

Balasundar Arumugan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

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

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This criminal revision case is filed under Section 438 r/w. 442 of BNSS, 2023, to set aside the impugned order dated 20.01.2026 passed in Crl.M.P. No.16629 of 2025 by CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai District to direct to return the seized property namely Vivo V20 Pro (Grey Colour) and Samsung S24 to the petitioner.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.R.Maduraiveeran

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Kishore Kumar

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This criminal revision has been filed to quash the impugned order dated 20.01.2026 in Crl.M.P. No.16629 of 2025 by the learned CCB and CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai District.



2. According to the petitioner, he had filed an application under Section 497 r/w.503 of BNSS in Crl.M.P.No.16629 of 2025 seeking release of the seized properties, namely a Vivo V20 Pro (Grey Colour) and a Samsung S24, 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.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this criminal revision petition is dismissed.

11-03-2026

Index: Yes/No

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rap

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.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 398 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

rap

CRL RC No. 398 of 2026

11-03-2026