

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
COIMBATORE**

Present: **Tmt. G. VIJAYA, B.A., M.L., PGDCFS**
Principal District & Sessions Judge, Coimbatore.

Wednesday, this the 11th day of March 2026

(திருவள்ளூர்வராண்டு, 2057, விசுவாவசு வருடம் மாசி திங்கள் 27-ஆம் நாள்
புதன்கிழமை)

Criminal Revision Petition No.14/2026
(CNR No.TNCB010009992026)

K. Navaneetha Krishnan

... Revision Petitioner/
Defacto Complainant

/vs/

The State

represented by the Public Prosecutor
The Inspector of Police,
Variety Hall Road Police Station,
Coimbatore.
Crime No.451/2025

... Respondent/Complainant

This Criminal Revision Petition came up before me for final hearing on 26-02-2026 in the presence of **Tvl. P. Ramesh Babu, C.R. Arun, B. Vinoth, K. Nithyadevi, L. Suvitha, M. Vetriselvan and R. Sreenidhi**, Advocates for the Revision Petitioner/Defacto Complainant and **Thiru.V.Ravichandran, Public Prosecutor**, represented for State and upon perusing the records and hearing the

arguments of both sides and upon perusing the petition and other relevant records and having stood over for consideration till this day, this Court passed the following

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Petition has been filed by the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant under Section 440 of the BNSS Act, seeking to modify the condition imposed upon the Petitioner by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Coimbatore in Cr.M.P.No.12014/2025, dated 16-12-2025 in respect of the production of sureties.

2. The Petitioner preferred an application before the Learned Trial Court u/s. 497 r/w 503 of BNSS seeking for return of his properties recovered in Crime No.451/2025 and on 16-12-2025 the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Coimbatore has granted interim custody of the properties by imposing certain conditions, against which the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant herein has preferred the present revision petition.

3. GROUNDS OF REVISION :

i. The Petitioner applied for return of property. The learned Judicial Magistrate No.V,

Coimbatore allowed the petition in Cr.M.P.No.12014/2025 on 16-12-2025 imposing certain conditions and one among them was, to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.1,30,00,000/- and one surety for like sum.

ii. The Petitioner unable to produce one surety worth Rs.1,30,00,000/- instead the Petitioner willing to produce 4 sureties with property documents.

iii. The details of the persons and the documents are as follows:

Sl. No.	Name	Document	Guideline Value of Property
1	Vijaya	Sale Deed – Doc.No.1753/2022	Rs.80,00,000/-
2	Vijayalakshmi	Sale Deed – Doc.No.2042/2018	Rs.19,70,980/-
3	Harish Kumaran	Sale Deed – Doc.No.5914/2025	Rs.18,09,496/-
4	Amutha	Sale Deed – Doc.No.1408/2009	Rs.8,83,920/-
Total			Rs.1,26,64,396/-

iv. The guideline value of the four properties Rs.1,26,64,396/- but the market value of the property Rs.1,60,00,000/-.

v. That the Petitioner is a goldsmith involved in jewel works for the past 25 years.

vi. The Petitioner will put to much loss and hardships unless this Court modified the condition imposed by the learned Trial Court.

vii. That he has not filed any similar petition in the Hon'ble High Court of Judicature at Madras.

viii. Hence, it is prayed to modify the condition imposed upon the Petitioner by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Coimbatore in Cr.M.P.No.12014/2025 by directing the Petitioner to produce four sureties instead of one surety and pass such other and necessary orders and render justice.

4. Points for consideration :

- i. Whether the condition No.(1) imposed in CMP No.12014/2025 dated 16-12-2025 by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.5, Coimbatore is to be modified or not? is the point for consideration.

Point :

5. Heard. Perused the petition and the relevant records. The present revision petition is preferred to modify the condition in the return of property order made in CMP No.12014/2025 dated 16-12-2025 by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.5, Coimbatore.

6. A petition was filed by the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant for return of property, namely gold jewels and gold bars weighing 1 kg 15 grams, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.5, Coimbatore. While imposing condition, the learned Judicial Magistrate No.5, Coimbatore directed the Petitioner to execute a

bond for Rs.1,30,00,000/- with one surety likesum to the satisfaction of the said Court. The present Criminal Revision Petition has been preferred by the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant to modify the said condition.

7. The learned counsel for the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant has submitted that, there is no dispute that the gold jewels and gold bars belongs to the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant, however, he is unable to produce one surety worth Rs.1,30,00,000/- as ordered by the learned Trial Court, instead, he is prepared to furnish four sureties with property documents.

8. The learned Public Prosecutor has objected this petition stating that, verifying the authenticity, unencumbered status, and valuation of four separate property documents takes more time and resources than verifying one. It complicates the process of potential forfeiture if the condition is breached.

9. This Court has given its anxious consideration on the rival contention of both the parties. On perusal, it reveals that, on the basis of the complaint lodged by the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant, FIR came to be registered in Crime No.451/2025 under Sections 331(4) and 305(a) BNS for the alleged theft committed

in the gold workshop. The Respondent police, during the investigation, recovered the looted jewels and bars and the case properties were produced before the Jurisdictional Court. The Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant has filed a petition under Section 497 r/w 503 BNSS seeking interim custody of the case properties in CMP No.12014/2025 and the learned Magistrate has passed an order dated 16-12-2025 granting interim custody of the jewels and bars.

10. The Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant has preferred the Criminal Revision Petitioner seeking to modify the condition directing the Revision Petitioner herein to execute a bond for Rs.1,30,00,000/- with one surety likesum. It is the main contention of the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant that, he is unable to produce one surety worth Rs.1,30,00,000/- as ordered by the learned Trial Court, instead, he is prepared to furnish four sureties with property documents.

11. After considering all the above said aspects, since the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant is unable to produce one wealthy surety for Rs.1,30,00,000/-, but he is able to produce four, each having lesser capacity but together totaling the amount, and as the conditions for the release of property should not be impossible to comply with, this Court is of the considered view that the

condition imposed by the learned Judicial Magistrate requiring one surety for Rs.1,30,00,000/- is liable to be modified. To secure the interests of justice and ensure the return of property, this Criminal Revision Petition is allowed.

1. The condition imposed in the order dated 16-12-2025 in CMP No.12014/2025 by the learned Judicial Magistrate No.5, Coimbatore, requiring one surety for Rs.1,30,00,000/- [Rupees One crore thirty lakh only] is modified and the Revision Petitioner/Defacto complainant is directed to produce four (4) sureties, each executing a bond totaling the amount of Rs.1,30,00,000/- [Rupees One crore thirty lakh only] to the satisfaction of the learned Trial Court.
2. All other conditions imposed in CMP No.12014/2025 dated 16-12-2025 remain unaltered.

Dictated to the Steno-typist and typed by her directly in the computer, corrected and pronounced by me in the open court, this the 11th day of March 2026.

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
COIMBATORE

LIST OF DOCUMENTS AND WITNESSES : NIL

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
COIMBATORE

Copy to :

The learned Judicial Magistrate No.V, Coimbatore.

Principal District Court,
Coimbatore
CRP No.14/2026
Dt : 11-03-2026
Draft / Fair order