

IN THE COURT OF DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
VEPPANTHATTAI

Present: E. Deiveegan, B.A., L.L.B.,
District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Veppanthattai.

Friday the 05th Day of June 2026

Cr.M.P. No. 133/ 2026 in Crime No.102/2026

Rajendiran (49/2026),
S/o. Perumal,
No.4, Annai Sathya Theru,
Kadambur Village,
Poolambadi Post,
Veppanthattai Tk,
Perambalur District.

..... Petitioner/ Accused

//Vs//

State Represented by,
Sub Inspector of Police,
Arumbavur P.S
Crime No. 102/2026
U/s. 173 of BNS .

.....Respondent/Complainant

This petition is filed on 27.05.2026 by the petitioner, pending before this court, upon hearing the counsel for petitioner named P.Kaviyarasu, Advocate and learned Additional Public Prosecutor for state and after perusing the records, this court delivers the following,

ORDER

1. This petition is filed by the petitioner u/s. 497 of BNSS 2023 seeking to return of property namely sum of Rs.1,00,000/- The police had seized the property in the aforesaid Crime Number for having involved in offense pertaining to 173 BNS which is on punishment for Bribery. The case in brevity is that the Petitioner is Accused for distributing cash for vote.

2. The Petitioner would submit that he is undoubtedly an innocent in the case which is falsely foisted against him. Further, it is put forth by him that he is the owner of the property and there is no cloud over the same and he is ready to obey any conditions imposed by this Court and thus, it is pleaded by him that he is not only a

stranger but also bystander andso prayed to grant interim custody of the said property.

3. Notice caused and received the reply of the Respondent.

4. The Respondent vehemently opposed and objected to grant interim custody.

5. Both side Heard, records perused.

6. At the outset, it is categorically admitted that the petitioner is the owner of the property and there is no iota of doubt. The Respondent vehemently opposed that the property alleged to be involved in the offence which if it is order infavour of the petitioner he will not return the property. It is time and again retratiated by Honorable Apex Court and Honorable High Court Madras that any property should be return to the proper person and it should not be return for flimsy reason.

The case in hand is clear as moon light that there is no dispute with respect to the ownership and further, retaining the property would become meaningless. The culpability of the Accused can be tested at the fag end of the trial. This court at this junction considers it not proper to go deep into the merit of the case but instead it will be just to peep into the ownership of the property. Ergo, this petition is allowed on conditions as follows,

7. In fine, it is here by ordered that

1. The Petitioner should produce two sureties each for the sum of Rs.2,00,000/-.

2. The Petitioner should produce photograph of the property along with CD.

3. The said Case property should not be destroyed or defaced.

4. The Petitioner should produce the property before the court as and when

ordered to do so.

5. If the petitioner fails to comply the aforesaid order this petition would automatically stands dismissed.

This Order is dictated by me to the Stenographer of this Court, directly typed by her in Computer, corrected and pronounced by me in open court, this the 05th day of June, 2026.

District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate,
Veppanthattai