

CNR : MHAM010011112025	Presented on	:-	17.03.2025
	Registered on	:-	18.03.2025
	Decided on	:-	01.06.2026
	Duration	:-	01 Y. 02 M. 14 D.

IN THE COURT OF ADDITIONAL SESSIONS JUDGE - 3,
AMRAVATI

(Presided Over by P. P. Sharma)

Criminal Revision Application No.39/2025

Exh.No.

Sheikh Kareem Sheikh Bismilla,

Age : 49 years, Occ. : Business,

R/o. Lal-Kha Pura, Nandgaon Peth,

Amravati, Tq. Dist. Amravati.

...Petitioner

-VERSUS-

State of Maharashtra,

P.S.O. Chandur Railway,

Tq. Chandur Railway, Dist. Amravati.

...Respondent

CLAIM : Criminal Revision under Section 438 of the
Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

Shri. S. J. Jakhad, learned Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri. P. S. Ganorkar, learned D.G.P for the respondent.

J U D G M E N T

(Delivered on : 01/06/2026)

The legality, propriety, and correctness of the order
dated 06/03/2025, below Exh.1 in Criminal M. A. No. 41/2025,

passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandur Railway, is assailed in this revision.

2) In short, the facts that led to filing the revision are,
Chandur Railway Police Station has registered an offence against the petitioner for offences punishable under Sections 11(1), 11(1)(g), and 11(1)(d) of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals Act, 1960, along with Sections 139 and 177 of the Motor Vehicles Act, in connection with Crime No. 44/2025. The petitioner had filed Application No. 41/2025 under Section 503 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, seeking custody of the seized buffaloes. The said application came to be rejected by the learned Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandur Railway, by the impugned order dated 06.03.2025..

3) Being aggrieved by and dissatisfied with allowing the application, the petitioner has preferred the revision.

4) The learned Advocate for the petitioner remained absent at the time of arguments. On the other hand, the learned A.P.P. appeared and submitted that the impugned order is legal and proper and has been passed in accordance with law.

5) In light of the grounds in the revision petition, submission across the bar, and material on record, the following points arise for consideration. I have recorded my findings against each of them for the reasons to follow;

SR. NO.	P O I N T S	F I N D I N G S
1)	Was the Judicial Magistrate First Class Court, Chandur Railway justified while passing the impugned order?	Yes.
2)	Whether any interference is warranted in the impugned order?	No.
3)	What order?	As per the final order.

REASONS

AS TO POINTS NO. 1 TO 3 :-

6) As per the grounds mentioned in the revision petition, the revision has been preferred on various grounds. It is contended that the learned Trial Court failed to consider the relevant provisions of the Act and the Rules. It is further contended that the learned Trial Court did not properly consider the documents produced by the petitioner to establish his ownership of the buffaloes. It is also urged that there was no allegation of slaughtering against the petitioner.

7) I have carefully gone through the grounds raised in the revision petition as well as the impugned order. It appears that the learned Trial Court has specifically observed that the manner in which the buffaloes were being transported was sufficient to establish cruelty towards the animals. The learned Trial Court has

also considered Rule 125(e) of the Central Motor Vehicles Rules and Rule 8 of the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (Care and Maintenance of Case Property Animals) Rules, 2017. The said Rule specifically provides that interim custody of seized animals shall not ordinarily be granted to the accused until the conclusion of the trial.

8) The learned Trial Court has assigned detailed reasons in paragraphs 6, 7, 8, and 9 of the impugned order. On the other hand, the petitioner has failed to demonstrate how the findings recorded by the learned Trial Court are perverse, illegal, or contrary to law. The material placed before the Trial Court prima facie indicates violation of the statutory provisions governing the transportation of animals. Therefore, I do not find any illegality, impropriety, or jurisdictional error in the impugned order warranting interference in exercise of revisional jurisdiction. Accordingly, Point No. 1 is answered in the affirmative, Point No. 2 in the negative, and Point No. 3 as per the final order.

ORDER

- 1) Criminal revision No.39/2025 against the order dated 06/03/2025, below Exh.1 in Criminal M. A. No. 41/2025, passed by the Judicial Magistrate First Class, Chandur Railway, is hereby rejected with cost.

- 2) An authenticated copy of this order and judgment be sent to the trial Court for information.

Date : 01/06/2026
Place : Amravati.

(P. P. Sharma)
Additional Sessions Judge-3,
Amravati.

CERTIFICATE

I affirm that the contents of this PDF file Judgment are the same, word for word, as per the original Judgment.

Name of the Stenographer : A. S. Rothe,
Court : P. P. Sharma,
District Judge-3, Amravati
Date : 01.06.2026
Judgment signed by the
presiding officer on : 01.06.2026
Judgment uploaded on : 01.06.2026