



CRL OP NO. 683 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20-01-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP NO. 683 of 2025

Ranjith Kumar

S/o.Vel Murugan, No.2/10, Eswaran Kovil Street, Senoor Village,
Katpadi Taluk, Vellore District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep by, The Inspector of Police,
Virudampet Police Station Virudampet, Vellore District. (Crime
No. 316 of 2024)

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s):

Vinodh Kumar
S.Suresh
A.P.Asok Prabahar Raja
S.Lal Devasagayam
P.Ramachandiran

For Respondent(s):

S.Santhosh
Public Prosecutor
Madras High Court.

ORDER

The petitioner apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(C), 4(1)(A) of TNP (Amendment) Act 2024 in Crime No.316 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution put forth by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

appearing for the respondent Police who is vehemently opposing for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is that the respondent Police received secret information about illegal selling

WEB COPY

of alcohols. Based on search, they found that the petitioner was found in possession of 25 bottles of 180 ml brandy.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to produce solvent sureties and to abide with any conditions that may be imposed by this Court, therefore, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stating that the petitioner has involved in illegal sale of 25 bottles of 180 ml brandy without valid permission or license. He further submitted that there are 4 previous cases against the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record including the FIR.



6. Taking note of the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and taking note of the fact that the petitioner has four previous cases, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

20-01-2025

msv

To
The Inspector of Police,
Virudampet Police Station
Virudampet, Vellore District.