



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

Friday, the Twenty Ninth day of March Two Thousand Nineteen

PRESENT

**The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI**

**CRL OP(MD) No.4766 of 2019**

THOMAIYAR

... PETITIONER / SOLE ACCUSED

Vs

STATE THROUGH  
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
R.S. MANGALAM POLICE STATION,  
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.  
(CRIME NO.44/2019)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : MR.K.RAMANATHAN Advocate

For Respondent : MR.S.CHANDRASEKAR,  
Additional Public prosecutor

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec. 439 Cr.P.C.


ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who was arrested on 15.03.2019 and remanded to judicial custody on 15.03.2019, for the offence under Sections 431 and 379 IPC r/w. Section 3(1) of Public Property Damage and Loss Act, 1984 in Cr.No.44 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2.It is the case of the prosecution that one unit of sand has been illegally transported by the petitioner in his vehicle.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. However, on instruction, he would further submit that the petitioner is ready to deposit any amount to the District Mineral Foundation Trust without prejudice to his rights.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>  
4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the vehicle was seized by the respondent police and there is no previous case pending against the petitioner. He further submitted



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 areas affected by illegal sand mining.

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.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) to the credit of the concerned District Mineral Foundation Trust, without prejudice to his rights and contentions. This amount so deposited shall be utilised by the Trust for rehabilitation works.

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 case independently on merits without reference to the amount deposited at the stage of bail.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the submission made by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) with two sureties, of whom, one should be a blood related surety, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvadanai, Ramanathapuram District and on further condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioner shall make a non refundable deposit of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) through demand draft 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 the learned Judicial Magistrate, after perusing the challan/ receipt, shall accept the sureties furnished by the petitioner;

(c) the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

(d) the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;



(e) the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(f) 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]**; and;

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

sd/-  
29/03/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE DISTRICT MUNSIF CUM JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,  
THIRUVADANAI, RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

2. DO THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,  
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

3. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
R.S. MANGALAM POLICE STATION,  
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT,

4. THE OFFICER INCHARGE,  
DISTRICT JAIL,  
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

5. THE CHAIRMAN/DISTRICT COLLECTOR,  
DISTRICT MINERAL FOUNDATION TRUST,  
RAMANATHAPURAM DISTRICT.

6. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,  
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to MR.K.RAMANATHAN Advocate SR.No.5782

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.4766 of 2019  
Date : 29/03/2019