

(2020) 12 GUJ CK 0031

In the Gujarat High Court

Case No : R/Special Criminal Application No. 6474 Of 2020

Sukhadevsingh Jaymalsingh Gleriye

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Gujarat

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 15-12-2020

Acts Referred:

Constitution Of India, 1950 — Article 226, 227
Code Of Criminal Procedure, 1973 — Section 451, 482
Gujarat Prohibition Act, 1949 — Section 98, 99

Citation : (2020) 12 GUJ CK 0031

Hon'ble Judges : B.N. Karia, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Aditya R Parikh, M.H. Bhatt

Final Decision : Allowed

Judgement

B.N. Karia, J

1. The petitioner has preferred this petition, seeking to invoke extraordinary jurisdiction of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution of India so

also inherent powers of this Court under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973 with a prayer to release Muddamal Vehicle i.e Isuzu

DÂ?Max CAB Chassis (goods Career Vehicle) bearing Registration No. GJÂ?27Â? TTÂ?3233 and chassis No. M3GTFR544KB802467.

2. It is the case of the petitioner that petitioner is the owner of the aforesaid vehicle and it is duly registered with the transport department of the

Government. He is, therefore, before this Court.

3. The case of the prosecution is that while the police personnels were on patrolling, they received a secret information of the vehicle in question

carrying liquor and when police authorities intercepted the same, on carrying out

the search of the said vehicle, its driver was found carrying liquor without any pass or permit. Therefore, an FIR being C.R. No.11101012200571 of 2020 came to be lodged with Danilimbda Police Station, Dist

Ahmedabad for the offence punishable under the Prohibition Act.

4. Heard learned advocate for the petitioner and learned APP for the respondent

5. Learned Advocate for the petitioner has urged that this Court has wide powers, while exercising such powers under Article 226 of the Constitution.

It can also take into account the ratio laid down in the case of 'SUNDERBHAI AMBALAL DESAI VS. STATE OF GUJARAT', AIR 2003 SC 638,

wherein, the Apex Court lamented the scenario of number of vehicles having been kept unattended and becoming junk within the police station premises.

6. Learned APP for the respondent has objected the submissions made by learned advocate for the petitioner and pointed out that this Court

(Coram: J.B. Pardiwala, J.) in the case of 'ANILKUMAR RAMLAL @ RAMANLALJI MEHTA VS. STATE OF GUJARAT' in Special Criminal

Application No. 2185 of 2018, Dated: 05.04.2018, and in the earlier decision in 'PARESHKUMAR JAYKARBHAI BRAHMBHATT VS. STATE

OF GUJARAT' in Special Criminal Application No. 8521 of 2017 and the allied matters decided on 15.12.2017. She, further, urged that, of course,

powers of this Court under Article 226 of the Constitution to order release of the vehicle can be exercised at any time, whenever the Court deems it

appropriate. She also pointed out that the recent decision of this Court in Special Criminal Application No. 2185 of 2018, where, this Court, in exercise

of the powers under Article 226 of the Constitution, has ordered the release of the vehicle, pending trial. She has also pointed out the order passed by

this Court in Special Criminal Application No. 1126 of 2018, Dated: 21.06.2018, in case of 'GUJARAT STATE ROAD TRANSPORT

CORPORATION THROUGH DEPOT MANAGER, MORBI, VS. STATE OF GUJARAT'.

7. On thus hearing both the sides, without determining the other issues raised by the petitioner, in reference to Sections 98 and 99 and other provisions

of the said Act and reserving that to be determined in future, in an appropriate proceedings being a contentious issue, this Court choses not to enter

into that arena in the present matter and instead exercise the powers under

Articles 226 and 227 of the Constitution.

8. This Court (Coram: J.B. Pardiwala, J.) however in the case of in 'ANILKUMAR RAMLAL @ RAMANLALJI MEHTA VS. STATE OF

GUJARAT' (Supra) in Special Criminal Application No. 2185 of 2018, Dated: 05.04.2018, has also returned the vehicle recently under Articles 226

and 227 of the Constitution, exercising its powers at an initial stage.

8.1 It would be worthwhile to refer profitably at this stage to the observations made by the Apex Court in 'SUNDERBHAI AMBALAL DESAI VS.

STATE OF GUJARAT' (Supra), which read as under:

15. Learned senior counsel Mr. Dholakia, appearing for the State of Gujarat further submitted that at present in the police station premises, number of

vehicles are kept unattended and vehicles become junk day by day. It is his contention that appropriate directions should be given to the Magistrates

who are dealing with such questions to hand over such vehicles to its owner or to the person from whom the said vehicles are seized by taking

appropriate bond and the guarantee for the return of the said vehicles if required by the Court at any point of time.

16. However, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that this question of handing over vehicles to the person from whom it is

seized or to its true owner is always a matter of litigation and a lot of arguments are advanced by the concerned persons.

17. In our view, whatever be the situation, it is of no use to keep such seized vehicles at the police stations for a long period. It is for the Magistrate

to pass appropriate orders immediately by taking appropriate bond and guarantee as well as security for return of the said vehicles, if required at any

point of time. This can be done pending hearing of applications for return of such vehicles.

8.2 The Apex Court has, thus, directed that within a period of six months from the date of production of the vehicle before the Court concerned,

needful be done. It even went to the extent of directing that where the vehicle is not claimed by the accused, owner, or the insurance company or by

third person, then such vehicle may be ordered to be auctioned by the Court. If the said vehicle is insured with the insurance company then insurance

company be informed by the Court to take possession of the vehicle which is not claimed by the owner or a third person. If Insurance company fails

to take possession, the vehicles may be sold as per the direction of the Court. The Court would pass such order within a period of six months from the date of production of the said vehicle before the Court. It also directed that before handing over possession of such vehicles, appropriate photographs of the said vehicle should be taken and a detailed panchnama should also be prepared. The Apex Court also held and specifically directed that concerned Magistrate would take immediate action for seeing that powers under Section 451 of the Code are properly and promptly exercised and articles are not kept for a long time at the police station, in any case, for not more than fifteen days to one month. It, therefore, directed that this object can also be achieved if there is proper supervision by the Registry of the concerned High Court in seeing that the rules framed by the High Court with regard to such articles are implemented properly.

9. Resultantly, this application is allowed. The authority concerned is directed to release the vehicle of the petitioner, muddamal vehicle i.e Isuzu Dâ?

Max CAB Chassis (goods Career Vehicle) bearing Registration No. GJÂ27ÂTTÂ3233 and chassis No. M3GTFR544KB802467, on the terms and conditions that the petitioner:

(i) shall furnish, by way of security, bond of Rs.6,00,000/Â? (Rupees Six Lakhs only) and solvent surety of the equivalent amount;

(ii) shall file an undertaking before the trial Court that prior to alienation or transfer in any mode or manner, prior permission of the concerned Court

shall be taken till conclusion of the trial;

(iii) shall also file an undertaking to produce the vehicle as and when directed by the trial Court;

(iv) in the event of any subsequent offence, the vehicle shall stand CONFISCATED.

9.1 Before handing over the possession of the vehicle to the petitioner, necessary photographs shall be taken and a detailed panchnama in that regard,

if not already drawn, shall also be drawn for the purpose of trial.

9.2 If, the IO finds it necessary, VIDEOGRAPHY of the vehicle also shall be done. Expenses towards the photographs and the videography shall be

BORNE by the petitioner.

Rule is made absolute, accordingly.

Registry is directed to send a copy of this order to the concerned Police Station through fax or e-mail forthwith.