



Crl.R.C.(MD)No.988 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

DATED : **22.06.2026**

CORAM:

THE HONOURABLE **MRS.JUSTICE L.VICTORIA GOWRI**

Crl.R.C.(MD)No.988 of 2026

Sam Sudharsan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. By the Inspector of Police,
Sathankulam Police Station,
Sathankulam,
Crime No.229 of 2025
PR No.233 of 2025

... Respondent

PRAYER : Revision filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023 to call for the records and set aside the order in Crl.M.P.NO.1363 of 2025 dated 23.01.2026 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate Court, Sathankulam, Thoothukudi, allow the above criminal revision, direct release of Two Wheeler bearing Reg. No.TN 92 B 2932.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Mohanasundaram

For Respondent : Mr.C.Susikumar

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



CrI.R.C.(MD)No.988 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenging the impugned order passed by the Judicial Magistrate, Sathankulam in CrI.M.P.No.1363 of 2025 dated 23.01.2026, this criminal revision case is filed.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had filed an application under Section 497 of the BNSS, seeking interim custody/return of the two-wheeler, namely a Royal Enfield motorcycle bearing Registration No.TN 92 B 2932. However, the said application came to be dismissed by the Court below. Aggrieved by the same, the present Criminal Revision Case has been filed.

3. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the respondent police submitted that the impugned order does not suffer from any illegality or infirmity, since the petitioner has failed to establish that he is the rightful owner of the vehicle sought to be returned. It was further submitted that the registered owner of the two-wheeler is one Abdul Hameed, who was duly summoned by the trial Court. Pursuant to the summons, the said Abdul Hameed appeared before the trial Court and stated that he had sold the vehicle to one Aashik and that he had no acquaintance with the petitioner. Recording the said submission



CrI.R.C.(MD)No.988 of 2026

and taking into consideration the materials available on record, the trial Court

dismissed the petition filed by the petitioner seeking return of the vehicle.

Therefore, according to the learned Government Advocate, the impugned order warrants no interference by this Court.

4. Heard the learned counsel on either sides and carefully perused the materials placed before this Court.

5. A careful perusal of the impugned order makes it clear that the trial Court found no valid ground to return the vehicle to the petitioner, primarily on the ground that he had failed to substantiate his ownership over the property. This Court does not find any infirmity or perversity in the reasoning adopted by the trial Court. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case fails and the same is dismissed.

22.06.2026

NCC : Yes / No
Index : Yes / No
Sm



WEB COPY



CrI.R.C.(MD)No.988 of 2026

L.VICTORIA GOWRI, J.

Sm

TO:-

1. The Inspector of Police,
Sathankulam Police Station,
Sathankulam, Thoothukudi.
2. The Judicial Magistrate, Sathankulam, Thoothukudi.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

Order made in
CrI.R.C.(MD)No.988 of 2026

Dated
22.06.2026