



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.Nos.13448, 13449, 13450 and 13451 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.06.2026

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN**

**Crl.O.P.Nos.13448, 13449, 13450 and 13451 of 2026**

Muddasir Mufeez

... Petitioner  
( in all Crl.OPs)

Vs.

State Represented by:  
The Inspector of Police,  
Pernambut Police Station,  
Vellore District.

... Respondent  
( in all Crl.OPs)

**COMMON PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Cr.Nos.294, 162, 70 of 2025 and Cr.No.534 of 2024 respectively pending investigation on the file of the Pernambut Police Station, Vellore District.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Krishnamoorthy  
( in all Crl.OPs)

For Respondent : Ms.R.S.Indira,  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)  
( in all Crl.OPs)



## **COMMON ORDER**

WEB COPY

The petitioner/A5 in all Criminal Original Petitions, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 331(4), 305(a) @ 331(4), 305(a), 317(2) and 317 (5) of BNS, 2023, in Cr.Nos.294, 162, 70 of 2025 and Cr.No.534 of 2024 respectively on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

### **2. Crl.OP.No.13448 of 2026:**

The case of the prosecution is that on 30.09.2025, unknown persons had allegedly committed theft of 5 ¼ sovereigns gold jewels worth about Rs.1,57,000/- from the residence of the defacto complainant. Allegedly, the stolen gold jewels were handed over by A4 to the petitioner, who in turn sold the gold jewels, which led to the registration of the FIR against the petitioner. Hence, the present case.

### **3. Crl.OP.No.13449 of 2026:**

The case of the prosecution is that on 11.06.2025, unknown persons had allegedly committed theft of 13 sovereigns gold jewels worth about Rs.3,90,000/- from the residence of the defacto complainant. Allegedly, the stolen gold jewels were handed over by A4 to the petitioner, who in turn sold



the gold jewels, which led to the registration of the FIR against the petitioner. Hence, the present case.

WEB COPY

4. Crl.OP.No.13450 of 2026:

The case of the prosecution is that on 07.03.2025, unknown persons had allegedly committed theft of 4 sovereigns gold jewels worth about Rs.1,20,000/- from the residence of the defacto complainant. Allegedly, the stolen gold jewels were handed over by A4 to the petitioner, who in turn sold the gold jewels, which led to the registration of the FIR against the petitioner. Hence, the present case.

5. Crl.OP.No.13451 of 2026:

The case of the prosecution is that on 20.12.2024, unknown persons had allegedly committed theft of 13 sovereigns gold jewels worth about Rs.3,90,000/- from the residence of the defacto complainant. Allegedly, the stolen gold jewels were handed over by A4 to the petitioner, who in turn sold the gold jewels, which led to the registration of the FIR against the petitioner. Hence, the present case.

6. The learned counsel for the Petitioner submits that though the petitioner was charged under Sections 331(4), 305(a) @ 331(4), 305(a), 317(2) and 317 (5) of BNS, 2023, he has not involved in the offence and there are about five accused involved in this case. The present petitioner is



arrayed as the 5<sup>th</sup> accused in all Criminal Original Petitions. A1 to A4 involved in the case were already enlarged on bail by the concerned Court.

WEB COPY

It is also the contention of the Petitioner that only based upon the confession made by A4, the present petitioner was implicated in this case.

7. At this juncture, the learned counsel for Government Advocate (Crl.Side) strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner as the case was house breaking and stolen jewels and if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, it would embolden him to commit similar offence.

8. However, as rightly contented by the petitioner's counsel, while perusing the order of the learned Sessions Judge in Crl.MP.No.872 of 2026, there is an observation that only based upon the confession made by A4 to the effect that he has handed over the stolen jewels to the present petitioner, he has been implicated in this offence.

9. In the present case, it is not in serious dispute that the co-accused A1 to A4 were already enlarged on bail. However, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) seriously objected about the recovery and would submit that only 4 sovereigns of gold recovered and unless the petitioner is taken into custody, the question of recovering the other materials is doubtful, cannot be ignored. Therefore, this Court is of the firm opinion that this petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.



Crl.OP.Nos.13448, 13449, 13450 and 13451 of 20\_\_

10. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions are dismissed.

WEB COPY

**02.06.2026**

Vv

To

1.The Inspector of Police,  
Pernambut Police Station,  
Vellore District.

2.The Public Prosecutor  
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.

**C.KUMARAPPAN, J.**



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.Nos.13448, 13449, 13450 and 13451 of 2026

Vv

**Crl.O.P.Nos.13448, 13449, 13450 and 13451 of 2026**

**02.06.2026**