



Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.06.2022

WEB COPY

CORAM :  
THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY  
Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

R.Manikandan

.. Petitioner

Vs

State through  
The Sub Inspector of Police,  
H-3 Maraimalainagar Police Station,  
Chengalpattu.  
(Crime No. 968 of 2021)

.. Respondent

Criminal Revision filed under Sections 397 r/w 401 Cr.P.C calling for the records of Judicial Magistrate No II Chengalpattu in C.M.P.No.11004 of 2021 and set aside the order dated 07.01.2022 and thereby direct the Judicial Magistrate No.II at Chengalpattu for the production of the vehicle "MARUTHI VITARA BREEZA ZDIP BS Car" bearing Registration No. TN 07 CF 4387 (Engine no. D13A5222735, Chasis No: MA3NFB1SGB100866) before the Court and return it to the petitioner pending investigation/confiscation proceedings in Crime No. 968 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Shreenik Raj  
For Respondent : Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar  
Government Advocate  
(Criminal Side)

ORDER

1. The petitioner is the lawful owner of the vehicle, being "MARUTHI VITARA BREEZA ZDIP BS Car" bearing Registration




Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

No. TN 07 CF 4387 (Engine no. D13A5222735, Chasis No: MA3NFB1SGB100866), which was seized for involvement in an offence under Section 294 (b), 328, 353 and 307 IPC r/w under Sections 7, 6(a), 9(2), 20(l) and 22(a) of Cigarette and Other Tobacco Products Atcs - 2003 r/w u/s 4(1)(a) of Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act in Crime No.968 of 2021 and was duly produced before the learned Judicial Magistrate, II, Chengalpattu. Thereafter, the petitioner moved an application in Crl.M.P.No.11004 of 2021 for interim custody of the vehicle which is dismissed by the order, dated 07.01.2022 on the ground that confiscation proceedings are already initiated and pending and therefore, it is not desirable to hand over the interim custody of the vehicle to the petitioner. Aggrieved by the same, the present Revision Case is laid before this Court.

2. Heard learned Counsel for the petitioner and learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent.

3. Learned Counsel for the petitioner submitted that even pending the confiscation proceedings, the vehicle can be returned and for the said proposition, he relied upon the orders of learned Single Judges of this Court in (i) Crl.R.C.No.501 of 2011, dated 07.04.2011 in **Sakthidevi Vs. State**; (ii) Crl.R.C.No.967 of 2020, dated 05.11.2020 in **Muthu Vs. State**; (iii) Crl.R.C.No.323 of 2021, dated



Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

04.06.2021 in **Karthik Vs. State**; (iv) Crl.R.C.No.631 of 2021, dated 20.10.2021 in **Rajendran Vs. State**. In all the above cases, the vehicle was ordered to be returned to the original owner, after taking note of the fact that confiscation proceedings are initiated. Therefore, the learned Counsel would pray that the vehicle can be ordered to be returned which would be subject to the confiscation proceedings.

4. Per contra, learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent would rely upon the orders of this Court in Crl.R.C.(MD).No.103 of 2018, dated 02.03.2018 in **Mohammed Shakul Hameed Vs. State** and in Crl.R.C.No.466 of 2022, dated 13.04.2022 in **Raja Vs. State**, whereunder, the learned Single Judges have taken a view that it may not be open for the entrustment of interim custody, pending confiscation proceedings. He would further submit that the order of the learned Judge in **Mohammed Shakul Hameed Vs. State** is based on the observations of the Division Bench in **David Vs. Shakthivel [(2010(1) L.W. (Crl.) 129]** and therefore, would pray that the Revision be dismissed.

5. I have considered the rival submissions made on behalf of both the sides and perused the material records of the case. Though there is a cleavage of opinion and two divergent views are being



Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

taken in the various judgments, which are referred on either side above, the Supreme Court of India in its judgment in **State of M.P.**

**Vs. Uday Singh [(2020) 12 SCC 733]** has held as follows:-

*"29.4.....The jurisdiction under Section 451 CrPC was not available to the Magistrate, once the authorised officer initiated confiscation proceedings."*

6. Therefore, I have no other option than to follow the said view that pending confiscation proceedings, it may not be open for entrustment of interim custody. But, at the same time, it is seen that in this case even the Trial Court's order was passed on 07.01.2022 and till date, the respondent have not completed the confiscation proceedings. Therefore, I am inclined to dispose of the Criminal Revision Case on the following terms:-

(i) Since the confiscation proceedings are pending, the petitioner is not entitled for return of the vehicle;

(ii) The respondent is directed to complete the confiscation proceedings within one month from the date of receipt of copy of the order;

(iii) If the confiscation proceedings are not completed within the date stipulated above, then the petitioner will be entitled for return of the custody of the vehicle on the following conditions:-

(a) The order of the learned Judicial Magistrate II, Chengalpattu, in Crl.M.P.No.11004 of 2021, dated 07.01.2022, is set



Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

aside.

WEB COPY

(b) The petitioner will be entitled for return of the "MARUTHI VITARA BREEZA ZDIP BS Car" bearing Registration No. TN 07 CF 4387 (Engine no. D13A5222735, Chasis No: MA3NFB1SGB100866).

(c) The petitioner shall produce the original RC Book of the vehicle and other relevant records to prove its ownership and the learned Judge, on perusal of the RC book and other records, retaining the Xerox copy of the same, shall return the original documents to the petitioner with a view to use the vehicle.

(d) The petitioner shall not alter or alienate the vehicle in any manner till adjudication is over.

(e) The petitioner shall also give an undertaking that it will not use the vehicle for any illegal activities in future and also to produce the vehicle as and when required by the respondent and by the court below and as well as by the District Collector of the District or authorized officer in that behalf by the Government.

(f) The petitioner shall participate in the confiscation proceedings, if any, initiated and shall produce the vehicle before the confiscation authority. This order is subjected to the confiscation proceedings.

(g) The petitioner shall not indulge in the similar offence either by using the present vehicle or any other vehicle. If the petitioner is found to be involved in any of similar offence in future either by way



Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

using the present vehicle or through any other vehicle, this order of returning the present vehicle ("MARUTHI VITARA BREEZA ZDIP BS Car" bearing Registration No. TN 07 CF 4387 (Engine no. D13A5222735, Chasis No: MA3NFB1SGB100866), shall stand automatically vacated, and this vehicle will be again seized by the respondent/police and produce before the Court concerned.

14.06.2022

ssm

To

- 1.The Sub Inspector of Police,  
H-3 Maraimalainagar Police Station,  
Chengalpattu.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate No.II at Chengalpattu.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

D.BHARATHA CHAKRAVARTHY, J.

ssm

Crl.R.C.No.664 of 2022

14.06.2022