

**HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE FOR RAJASTHAN
BENCH AT JAIPUR**



S.B. Criminal Miscellaneous (Petition) No. 5552/2017

1. Ram Kishan S/o Danaram, R/o Sikandara Tehsil Sikrai Distt. Dausa. Owner Of Vehicle Motorcycle No. RJ-29-SM-9942
2. Girraj S/o Danaram, R/o Sikandara Tehsil Sikrai Distt. Dausa. Owner Of Vehicle Motorcycle No. RJ-29-SM-9942
3. Moti S/o Danaram, R/o Sikandara Tehsil Sikrai Distt. Dausa. Owner Of Vehicle Motorcycle No. RJ-29-SM-9942

-----Petitioners

Versus

1. State of Rajasthan Through P.P.
2. Saroj W/o Girraj D/o Sitaram, R/o Sikandara Tehsil Sikrai Distt. Dausa.

-----Respondents

For Petitioner(s)	:	Mr. P.S. Rajawat
For Respondent(s)	:	Mr. Rajesh Choudhary, GA cum AAG Mr. Jitendra Singh Rathore, PP Mr. Poonam Chand Sharma

JUSTICE ANOOP KUMAR DHAND

Order

29/04/2026

1. By way of filing the instant petition, a challenge has been led to the impugned order dated 03.09.2016, passed by the Judicial Magistrate, First Class, Sikrai, District Dausa, by which the application submitted by the petitioners for getting supurdagi of motorbike bearing registration No.RJ-29SM-9942, has been rejected and the similar application, submitted by the respondent No.2 for getting the supurdagi of the aforesaid vehicle, has been allowed.

2. It was the case of the petitioners that they are the registered owners of the vehicle and the same was seized by the Police in connection with FIR No.203/2016, registered with Police Station Sikandara, District Dausa, under Section 498A & 406 IPC. Thereafter, an application was submitted by the petitioners and the respondent No.2 for getting possession of the aforesaid vehicle on supurdagi on the basis of their rival claims.

3. This fact has come on the record that the marriage of the respondent No.2 was solemnized with the petitioner No.2 and the amount for purchase of the subject bike was paid by the family members of the petitioner No.2 and the receipt in this regard was issued in their favour. This fact was also mentioned on a demand note. Since, the husband of the respondent No.2 was a minor, hence, the registration of the vehicle was made in the name of the petitioner No.2's father.

4. The evidence collected by the Investigating Agency indicates that the motorbike vehicle was purchased by the respondent No.2 and her family members and the same is her *streedhan*. Keeping in view all these material aspects of the matter, the application submitted by the respondent No.2 was allowed and the application submitted by the petitioners was rejected.

5. The aforesaid order was assailed by the petitioners, by way of filing the Criminal Revision Petition No.18/2017 before the Court of the Additional Sessions Judge, Bandikui, District Dausa, however, the same was also rejected vide impugned order dated 02.06.2017, keeping in view the above stated facts.

6. In the considered opinion of this Court, both the Courts below have passed a reasoned and cogent order in favour of the

respondent No.2, which does not require any interference of this Court and this Court finds no illegality in the orders impugned. Accordingly, the instant petition is liable to be and is hereby rejected.

7. Stay application and all pending application(s), if any, also stand disposed of.

(ANOOP KUMAR DHAND),J

Shivam/32