



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 21.04.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL RC No. 649 of 2026

Thangavelu

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State, rep. by, The Inspector of Police,
Karumathampatty Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:- This Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 and 442 of BNSS, 2023, pleaded to call for the records relating to the order dated 27.02.2026 made in Crl.M.P.No.224 of 2026 passed by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sulur and set aside the same.

For Petitioner(s):

M/s.N.Ponraj

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Kishore Kumar

Government Advocate, Criminal side.

ORDER

The revision challenges the dismissal of the petitioner's application seeking return of his vehicle viz., Ashok Leyland Tipper Lorry bearing Registration No. TN 37 ES 2223 -1 No, which was seized during the course of investigation in Crime No.41 of 2026 registered for the offences under Section 21(1), 4(1), 4(1)(1A) of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.



2. It is the case of the prosecution that the accused in the said case was transporting approximately 6 units of gravel mines without valid permission and thus committed the offence under Sections 21(1), 4(1), 4(1)(1A) of Mines & Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957.

3. During the course of the investigation, the petitioner's vehicle, which was used by the accused, was seized. The petitioner sought return of vehicle, which came to be dismissed by the impugned order on the ground that there is a possibility that the petitioner will again misuse the vehicle for committing the offence and apart from that, investigation is at initial stage.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is not an accused; that he is the owner of the vehicle and therefore he is entitled for interim custody of the vehicle on any stringent conditions.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) confirmed the fact that the petitioner is not an accused in this case and that he is the owner of the vehicle, and that confiscation proceedings have been initiated.

6. At this juncture, it is appropriate to refer to the judgment of the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in ***Bishwajit Dey Vs. The State of Assam*** reported in **(2025) 3 SCC 241**, where the Hon'ble Supreme Court of India held



that the mere risk of misuse of the vehicle by a third party, by itself, is not sufficient to take coercive action of refusing the prayer, as the fear or suspicion is only a hypothetical situation. Apart from that, if the vehicle is not released, there is every possibility that it will be wasted to the vagaries of the weather. Further, its value will also reduce. Contrarily, putting the vehicle for beneficial utility and to earn livelihood and to use the vehicle for the benefit of the society at large, could be achieved by granting interim custody of the vehicle.

7. Accordingly, considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, and that the petitioner being the owner of the vehicle and not an accused, this Court is inclined to grant interim custody of the vehicle to the petitioner subject to the result of the confiscation proceedings. However, considering the nature of involvement of the vehicle in transporting the contraband, this Court deems it appropriate to impose the following conditions:

(i) The petitioner shall execute a personal bond for a sum of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) with two sureties for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sulur;

(ii) the petitioner is directed to make a non-refundable deposit of Rs.50,000/- (Rupees Fifty Thousand Only) directly to the credit to the credit of **(Non refundable) towards the account of CANCER INSTITUTE (WIA), Adayar, Savings Bank Account maintained at Union Bank of India, Madhya**



**Kailash Branch, Cancer Institute(WIA),
Dr.S.Krishnamurthi Campus, Sardar Patel Road,
Chennai-36, bearing SB Account No.149710011005477,
IFSC Code No.UBIN0814971, Branch Name and Code
814971, MICR No.600026110 and to produce the Bank
Challan before the concerned Magistrate and the receipt
shall be produced at the time of executing the bond;**

(ii) The petitioner shall produce the original RC Book along with a self-attested Photostat copy of the RC Book of the vehicle and other relevant records to prove his ownership. The learned Judicial Magistrate, Sulur shall peruse the RC book and other records, retain a xerox copy of the same and return the original RC book to the petitioner;

(iii) The petitioner shall not alter or alienate the vehicle in any manner;

(iv) The petitioner shall also give an undertaking that he will produce the vehicle as and when required by the respondent and by the Court below.

(v) The return of property would be subject to the result of the confiscation proceedings.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case stands allowed.

21.04.2026

sma



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 649 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Sma

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Sulur.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Karumathampatty Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras

CRL RC No. 649 of 2026

21.04.2026