



2026:CGHC:14713



2026:CGHC:14713

NAFR

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

CRMP No. 890 of 2026

Ram Avtar Sahu S/o Ashik Ram Sahu Aged About 43 Years R/o Village Koylari, Post Koylari, Tehsil Sahaspur Lohara, Police Station-Singhanpuri (Jungle), District - Kabirdham, C.G.

... **Petitioner(s)**

versus

1 - State Of Chhattisgarh Through- The Collector (Durg), District- Durg, C.G.

2 - Bhagchand Sahu S/o Milapram Sahu Aged About 41 Years R/o Village Khursipar, Police Station Khursipar, Bhilai, District Durg, C.G.

... **Respondent(s)**

For Petitioner(s) : Mr. Chandrikaditya Pandey, Advocate

For Respondent(s) : Mr. Rajkumar Sahu, P.L.

Hon'ble Shri Justice Arvind Kumar Verma

Order on Board

30/03/2026

1. The present petition has been filed by the applicant seeking modification of the order passed by this Court in CRMP, whereby in paragraph 11 it was observed that *as and when the vehicle is seized by the police, the applicant shall have the right to file an*



application for supurdnama. By way of the present petition, the applicant seeks a further direction that he may be permitted to raise objections and be afforded an opportunity of hearing in the event respondent No. 2 files any application for supurdnama.

2. Learned counsel for the applicant submits that unless such liberty is expressly incorporated, the applicant may suffer prejudice at the time of consideration of the application for interim custody.
3. I have considered the submission made by learned counsel for the applicant and perused the earlier order passed by this Court.
4. At the outset, it is to be noted that the earlier order has already granted liberty to the applicant to file appropriate application before the trial Court as and when the vehicle is seized. The grant of such liberty inherently includes the right to participate in the proceedings arising out of such application, in accordance with law. Therefore, no further clarification or modification is required.
5. More importantly, this Court cannot review or alter its own final order in exercise of jurisdiction under Section 482 of the Code of Criminal Procedure, 1973, in view of the express bar contained in **Section 362 of Cr.P.C.**, which reads to the effect that no Court, after it has signed its judgment or final order disposing of a case, shall alter or review the same except to correct clerical or arithmetical errors.
6. The relief sought by the applicant is not in the nature of correction of any clerical or arithmetical mistake, but amounts to seeking a



substantive modification of the earlier order, which is impermissible under law.

7. The Hon'ble Supreme Court as well as various High Courts have consistently held that once a final order is passed, the same cannot be reviewed or modified by the same Court in criminal jurisdiction, except within the limited scope provided under Section 362 of Cr.P.C.
8. In view of the above legal position, this Court is of the considered opinion that the order already passed does not require any modification and the present petition is not maintainable.
9. Accordingly, the present CRMP stands **dismissed**.

Sd/-

(Arvind Kumar Verma)

JUDGE

Madhurima