



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.70 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.02.2026

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

Crl.R.C.No.70 of 2026

M.Arunvel Kumar

...Petitioner

-Vs-

The State Represented by Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Chengalpattu,
Chengalpattu District.

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 442 of BNSS, to set aside order passed by the Judicial Magistrate-II, Chengalpattu, dated 14.07.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.1968 of 2025 in Crime No.8 of 2024.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.Y.Kajanavas
For Respondent	:	Mr.Vinothraja, Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The Revision challenges the order passed by the learned Magistrate dismissing the petitioner's application under Section 497 and Section 503 of BNSS seeking return of 20 documents, which were seized during the course of investigation. The petitioner is an accused in Crime No.8 of 2024 for the offences under Sections 465, 467, 468, 471, 420 and 120(B) IPC.



Crl.R.C.No.70 of 2026

2.The gist of the allegation in the FIR is that the petitioner had entered into a partnership deed with the defacto complainant by showing fabricated records and received huge sum of money. During the course of investigation, about 20 documents were seized during the house search from the petitioner's premises. The petitioner sought for return of the said documents and the same was dismissed by the impugned order.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has settled substantial amount to the defacto complainant; that in any case, the allegations of forgery and cheating would not be made out; and that the documents seized from the petitioner are not relevant for the purpose of proving the case and ought to be returned to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate *per contra* would submit that the documents were seized for the purpose of comparison of the signature of the petitioner with his admitted signature and the report of the handwriting expert has been filed and the final report has also been filed. To the specific question as to how those documents are relevant for the progress of the case, the learned Government Advocate was unable to say as to how those documents are relevant.



Crl.R.C.No.70 of 2026

5.In any case, since the signatures are now been compared, this Court is of the view that the further retention of the documents is not required for the purpose of the trial and hence, the trial Court is directed to return the documents to the petitioner on the following conditions;

- (1) The petitioner shall not alienate any of the properties covered under the documents, without permission from the learned Magistrate;
- (2) The petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- (Rupees Five Lakhs only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate-II, Chengalpattu.

6.It is needless to state that the respondent shall be at liberty to invoke Section 107 of BNSS for attachment, if the conditions are satisfied.

7.Accordingly, the Criminal Revision Case is allowed.

04.02.2026

Tsg



Crl.R.C.No.70 of 2026

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

Tsg

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate-II, Chengalpattu.

2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Chengalpattu,
Chengalpattu District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.

Crl.R.C.No.70 of 2026

04.02.2026