



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Friday, the Fourteenth day of December Two Thousand Eighteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP(MD) No.22104 of 2018

ARUN

... PETITIONER / SOLE ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
NATHAM POLICE STATION,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
(IN CRIME NO. 830 OF 2018)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.B.JAMEEL ARASU Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.S.CHANDRASEKAR,Additional Public PROsecutor

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 353 and 379 of IPC r/w 21(1) of Mines and Minerals Development and Regulation Act registered in Crime No.830 of 2018, seeks anticipatory bail.


2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner illegally transported one Unit of sand.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case and that therefore, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent would submit that if the person is caught with illegal sand in the mining area, he has to be directed to deposit the conditional amount to the credit of Crime number. However, in view of formation of District Mineral Foundation Trust in each district, the amount may be deposited to the credit of the said Trust for rehabilitation in the illegal sand mining affected areas.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

5.In view of the rehabilitation undertaken by the State



Government under the Tamil Nadu District Mineral Foundation Rules, 2017, and in order to curb the illegal sand mining activities and also considering the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this Court is of the opinion that the petitioner is directed to make a non refundable deposit of **Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five thousand only)** to the credit of the concerned District Mineral Foundation Trust, without prejudice to their rights and contentions.

6.It is made clear that the deposit of the amount by the petitioner to the Trust would not amount to admission of guilt. The trial Court shall deal with the the case independently on merits without reference to the amount deposited at the stage of anticipatory bail.

7.Taking into consideration the facts of the case and the submission made on either side, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner certain conditions.

8.Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Natham, Dindigul District, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) each with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent Police or to the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(i) if the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days, this order shall stand automatically cancelled.

(ii) the petitioner shall make a non refundable deposit of **Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five thousand only)** to the credit of the Chairman/District Collector, District Mineral Foundation Trust of the concerned District, without prejudice to his defence before the trial Court and thereafter, the learned Judicial Magistrate shall accept the sureties furnished by the petitioner;

(iii) the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

(iv) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(v) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(vi) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action



against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**.

(vii) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229-A IPC.

sd/-
14/12/2018

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
NATHAM, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
DINDIGUL.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
NATHAM POLICE STATION, DINDIGUL DISTRICT.
- 4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT MADURAI.

COPY TO

THE CHAIRMAN/DISTRICT COLLECTOR,
DISTRICT MINERAL FOUNDATION TRUST,
DINDIGUL DISTRICT.

+1. CC to Mr.B.JAMEEL ARASU Advocate SR.No.23501

PS/JC/SAR-3/19.12.2018/3P/7C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.22104 of 2018
Date :14/12/2018