

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

R/SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION NO.10343 of 2026

=====

SORUBHA CHANDUBHA GOHIL
Versus
STATE OF GUJARAT & ORS.

=====

Appearance :

MR JIGAR L PATEL for the Petitioner.

MR NIKUNJ KANARA, AGP for the Respondents.

CORAM:**HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE NIRZAR S. DESAI**

Date : 30/07/2026
ORDER

Leave to amend the date of seizure.

1. **RULE.** Learned Assistant Government Pleader waives serves of Rule for and on behalf of the respondents.

2. With the consent of the learned counsels for the parties, the matter is taken up for final hearing and disposal.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the vehicle of the petitioner has been seized on 18.02.2025 by the respondent authorities and the complaint is not preferred by the authorities within stipulated period, i.e. after 45 days. Learned counsel submits that since the complaint has not been filed within the stipulated period, as per the Rule 12 of the Gujarat Mineral (Prevention of Illegal Mining, Transportation and Storage) Rules, 2017, the petitioner is entitled to release of his vehicle being TATA Hitachi Machine Excavator, Model No.EX200LC pending the

proceedings. Learned counsel in support of his contentions places reliance on the order passed by the Coordinate Bench of this Court dated 8.8.2024 in Special Civil Application No.8664 of 2024.

4. Learned Assistant Government Pleader appearing for the respondents upon instructions received from Ms.Vipul Solanki, Geologist, Chhotaudepur, submits that the complaint has been filed after the stipulated period of time under the Rules. Learned Assistant Government Pleader submits that appropriate order may be passed in the present case.

5. In view of the aforesaid submissions, it is revealed that the complaint has not been filed within the stipulated period of time under the Rules, 2017. Various orders have been passed by this Court, wherein it has been held that it would be obligatory on the part of the investigator to approach the Court of Sessions with a written complaint and produce the seized properties before the Court within the stipulated period under the Rules. In absence of such exercise, the purpose of seizure and the bank guarantee would stand frustrated. Resultantly, the property will have to be released in favour of the person from whom it was seized without insisting for the bank guarantee.

6. In view of the fact that the vehicle in question having been seized on 18.02.2025 and the complaint has been after 45 days, the vehicle of the petitioner be released on the following conditions :-

“(i) The petitioner shall file an undertaking on oath before the Competent Authority that the petitioner shall not transfer,

alienate, part with the possession of the vehicle being TATA Hitachi Machine Excavator, Model No.EX200LC or create any charge over the vehicle in question till the conclusion of the trial.

(ii) The petitioner shall produce the vehicle being TATA Hitachi Machine Excavator, Model No.EX200LC as and when the authority or the Court concerned directs him to do so.”

7. It is made clear that this Court has not gone into the merits of the case and no observation is made thereon.

8. The concerned Court below shall decide the complaint on its merits in accordance with law. It is also made clear that the respondent authorities are permitted to take appropriate step(s) in accordance with law against the petitioner under the Rules, 2017.

9. In view of the aforesaid observations, the present Special Civil Application stands disposed of. Rule is made absolute accordingly. No order as to costs.

Direct service is permitted.

(NIRZAR S. DESAI,J)

SAVARIYA