

MHYA190000242026 	R.C.C No.8/2026 P.S. Ralegaon Vs. Sandip Bramhanvade through Power of attorney Rajendra Giri
---	---

ORDER BELOW EXH.- 06

(Date: 10-06-2026)

This is an application filed by applicant namely, **Sandip Ajabrao Bramhanvade through Power of attorney Rajendra Ashok Giri** under section 497 of Bhartiya Nagrik Suraksha Sanhita seeking interim custody and for releasing his Trolley Registration No. **MH 29 C 6774 Chasis No. RT/0056/00 Engin No. Nill** was seized by Ralegaon Police Station in Crime No. 506/2025. The above said vehicle belongs to applicant. The learned counsel for applicant submitted that the above said vehicle was seized in connection with Crime No. 506/2025. Thus, applicant claims said vehicle on supurndama. The applicant further submitted that, applicant is farmer. Applicant is owner of seized vehicle. The applicant further submitted that, The seized vehicle is necessary to the applicant for his livelihood. If seized vehicle is not released then there is possibility to damage its color, spare parts, wheels etc it would cause economical damage of the applicant. The applicant is ready to abide all conditions imposed by this Hon'ble Court. The applicant will not change color and nature of seized vehicle. The applicant did not transfer, sell seized vehicle. Therefore he prayed to allow his application.

2. The learned APP for state has filed his say to this application and took objection and stated that the crime is very serious in nature and against the government property. As per final report of said crime and as per said application along with documents attached with it there is difference between name of owners of alleged property. There is absence about seizure of alleged property which is mentioned in said supurndama application. The

property mentioned in final report and in application of suprutnama is different, in nature and colour or with number, without number. The learned APP further submitted that the alleged property which is mentioned in final report already seized by respected revenue authorities and the property which mentioned application of suprutnama, there is no single document regarding seizure of it. Due to above said reason there is a question about ownership, seizure and legal jurisdiction of said court. The investigation is in right direction, progressive and prima-facie the collection of evidence in final report is against the accused/applicant. If the property mentioned in application of supurtnama is released on then every chance about change its nature, sale, mortgage etc. and involved in similar type of crime. Hence, as per final report, fact, record and all above reason the application is not tenable and liable to be rejected.

3. Perused record, documents filed by applicant, heard learned advocate for the accused and learned APP for state, it seems that applicant has filed this application for seeking interim custody of seized vehicle in crime no 506/2025. In present matter chargesheet is filed. The applicant has stated in his application vide Exh. 6 about following particulars about seized vehicle in crime no. 506/2025 as makers name- Rohan trailer, Vehicle no – MH 29 C 6774, Colour – Red ,Model – Trailer ,Chasis No. - RT/0056/00, Engine no.- Nill ,Fuel – Nill ,Wheels – Two Wheeler , Registration date – 14.03.2021. It is necessary to see seizure panchnama and muddemal property seized in crime no. 506/2025 vide RCC No. 8/2026. In seizure panchnama the seized property is mentioned as “ एक विना क्रमांकाचा ट्रॅक्टर मुंडा ज्याचा मुख्य क्रमांक MH 29 CB 9089 सोनालिका कंपनीचा DI 495 III मॉडेल ज्याला हिरव्या रंगाची विना क्रमांकाची ट्रॅक्टर ट्रॉली ज्यात एक ब्रास रेती किंमत अंदाजे ७०००/- रुपये असलेली एकुण किंमत अंदाजे ६,०७,०००/- मुंडा Ch. No. J2C5J121899153.” In muddemal receipt vide RCC No. 8/2026 seized property mentioned in seizure panchnama is same as mentioned in muddemal receipt. Perused document that is certificate of registration of

motor vehicle in lieu of booklet state of Maharashtra filed by applicant, it seems that name of registered owner is Mr. Pandharinath Govindrao Durge. And on back side of said certificate of registration the name of sundip ajab bramhanvade is mentioned. The particulars as mentioned in the application vide exh. 6 is same as on certificate of registration of motor vehicle in lieu of booklet state of Maharashtra filed by applicant. Perused seizure panchnama, muddemal property and application of applicant and documents on record, it seems that the seized property in RCC No. 8/2026 and property mentioned in the application vide Exh. 6 is different. In such circumstances the applicant did not established that he is owner of seized property vide RCC No. 8/2026. Hence the present application deserves to be rejected. Hence, I pass following order.

ORDER

- i. Application vide Exh. 6 is hereby rejected.
- ii. The application is disposed off accordingly.

Date : 10-06-2026
Place: Ralegaon

[Ramchandra Dattatray Mane]
Judicial Magistrate First Class,
Court No.2, Ralegaon.