

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07.01.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP NO. 125 of 2025

1.G.Sakthivel
2.C.Balamurugan

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by the Inspector of Police
J-3, Guindy Police Station
Chennai,

[Crime No. 432 of 2024]

Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No. 432 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.V.Bhagyaraj

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Santhosh, Government Adv. Crl.Side

==

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 303(1) of BNS, 2023 r/w Sec.21(1) of Mines and Minerals (Development & Regulation) Act, 1957, in Crime No. 432 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.




2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners had transported 3 units of savudu sand by using lorry bearing Registration no. TN-23-J-7672 without any valid licence from the Government. Hence the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioner is innocent and that a case of sand theft has been fabricated against them. He would further submit that they have no previous case against them and without prejudice to their contentions, the petitioners are prepared to deposit an amount of Rs.7,500/- towards any charitable organization or association. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.


4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent Police while opposing for grant of bail would submit that the quantity of savudu sand involved are 3 units. He would further submit that the petitioners have no previous case pending against them. However, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.



6. In respect of grant or refusal of anticipatory bail to the persons indulging in illegal sand mining, smuggling and theft of sand and minerals, the Apex Court in *S.Mohamed Shahul Hameed Vs. State rep. by the Inspector of Police (Special Leave to Appeal (Crl.) No.6029 of 2020 dated 11.12.2020)*, while expressing disagreement with the sweep observation made by this Court on the aspect of continuous misuse of discretionary power by the offenders and the enforcers as well in an organised manner, has clarified that in consideration of anticipatory bail, the role assigned to a person would have to be considered.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the sand involved is small quantity and that there is no previous case pending against the petitioners, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. However, in order to curb illegal sand mining activities and taking into consideration the voluntary submission made by the petitioners offering to deposit a considerable amount to any charitable organization or association, this Court is of the opinion that as one of the conditions for grant of anticipatory bail, the petitioners may be directed to deposit a sum of **Rs.7,500/- (Rupees Seven Thousand Five Hundred only)** to the credit of District Legal Services Authority, Chennai, without prejudice to their right and contentions before the trial Court.



8.It is made clear that merely because the petitioners are depositing the amount, it would not amount to the petitioners admitting their guilt in the criminal case and such amount is being paid without prejudice to the right of the petitioners.

9.Accordingly, the petitioners shall make a non refundable deposit of **Rs.7,500/- (Rupees Seven Thousand Five Hundred only)** by way of Demand Draft/RTGS/NEFT to the credit of the **District Legal Services Authority, Chennai**, and on such deposit and on receipt of proof of payment, 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 on which the order copy made ready, before the learned ***IX Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai***, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further conditions that:

[a] the petitioners and 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 petitioners shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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]**.

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

07.01.2025

MSM



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No. 125 of 2025



A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

MSM

Crl.O.P.No.125 of 2025

07.01.2025