

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL FIRST CLASS MAGISTRATE- I,  
ALAPPUZHA.

Present:- **Smt. Shana Beegam, Judicial First Class Magistrate.**

Dated this the 18<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025.

**C.M.P. 5531/2025 in CC 911/2025**

Petitioner : SNDP Ambalapuzha Union,  
Kidangamparambu, Thathampally P.O.,  
Alappuzha represented by its Manager  
Pradeep, Tharathu veliyil, Aryad South,  
Alappuzha.

*(by Adv. G. Harikumar)*

Cr. Petitioner : State of Kerala – represented by the  
Sub Inspector of Police, Alappuzha  
South PS in Crime No. 675/2025.

*(by APP, Alappuzha)*

Section of Law : U/s. 497 of B.N.S.S.

**ORDER**

This petition is filed by the Manager of SNDP Union, Ambalapuzha for releasing the pot made of bronz and the standing lamp stolen by the accused in this crime u/s. 497 of BNSS.

2. The petitioner is the Manager of the SNDP Union and the articles were owned by the said union and the same was seized by the police in

connection with this crime. These articles are very essential for the said union and for its use. Hence, he prayed for the release of the vehicle.

3. The FIR in this crime was registered alleging commission of offence u/s. 305(e) BNS against the accused. The said articles were seized by the police from the accused and sent to court as per TR 263/2025.

4. Copy of the petition was served to the learned A.P.P. and the Investigating Officer filed report stating that if the articles were returned to the petitioner, it will affect the outcome of the trial. Hence, he prayed for dismissing the petition.

5. The counsel for the petitioner submitted that the articles were seized by the police in connection with this case. The articles are normally used by the said establishment for their functions. Hence, he prayed for allowing the petition.

6. Heard both sides and perused the case records.

7. Points that arise for consideration are:-

1. Is the petition allowable ?
2. Finding and order ?

**Point No. 1**

8. On going through the records, it is seen that the

investigation in this case is completed and the case was taken on file as CC 911/2025. Hence, there is no need to keep the articles in the custody of the prosecution. Hence, further custody of the articles is not necessary. In such circumstances, I am of the opinion that it is just and proper to return the articles to the petitioner by imposing conditions. The point is answered accordingly.

**Point No. 2**

On the basis of the above discussion, the petition is allowed by imposing stringent conditions:-

1. The petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two solvent sureties each for like sum.
2. The petitioner shall not cause any material alteration to the said articles.
3. On release on bond, the said articles shall be kept in safe custody by the petitioner without being assigned or in any means transferred under documents or otherwise.
4. The petitioner shall produce photographs of said articles at his own expense and it shall be attested by the SHO. SHO shall prepare an inventory mahazar of the said vehicle.
5. The petitioner shall file an affidavit stating that he shall produce the articles released in his favour before the Court as and when required.

(Pronounced in Open Court on this the 18<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2025.)

**Judicial First Class Magistrate-I,  
Alappuzha.**