



WEB COPY



CRL OP No.901 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **22.01.2025**

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP No.901 of 2025

Ramu

S/o/Chinnathambi, No.109 A, Mariyamman Koil
Street, Melayanoorchakkadi, Reddiarpalayam,
Thandrapattu, Thiruvannamalai District-606 708.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State by, The Inspector of Police,
Thanipadi Police Station, Thiruvannamalai District.
Crime No. 03 of 2024.

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s): Mr. S. Silambu Selvan

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Santhosh, Government Advocate (Criminal Side).

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2) and 326(a) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, r/w Section 21(1) of Mines and Minerals Act, in Crime No.03 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was found to be involved in the illegal transport of $\frac{1}{4}$ unit of river sand in a Tractor. Hence, this case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that, without prejudice to his contentions, the petitioner is willing to deposit a non-refundable amount to any charitable organization or association. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent Police opposed the granting of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stating that the quantity of river sand involved in this case is quarter unit and that the petitioner is also willing to abide by any stringent conditions. He further submitted that the petitioner has two previous cases dating back to the year 2022.



5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner 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 organized 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 quantity involved in this case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. However, in order to curb illegal sand mining activities and



taking into consideration the voluntary submission made by the petitioner 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 petitioner may be directed to deposit a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) to the credit of District Legal Services Authority, Thiruvannamalai District, without prejudice to his rights and contentions before the trial Court.

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

9. Accordingly, the petitioner shall make a non refundable deposit of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)** by way of Demand Draft/RTGS/NEFT to the credit of the **District Legal Services Authority, Thiruvannamalai District**, 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 their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the *learned District Munsif Cum Judicial Magistrate, Thandrampet*, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.5,000/- (Rupees Five 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 petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[b] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during the investigation or during the trial.

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during the investigation or during the trial.

[d] 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 was released on bail by the



WEB COPY

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];

[e] If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be
registered under Section 269 of BNS.

22.01.2025

klr

To

1.The State by,
The Inspector of Police,
Thanipadi Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District. Crime No. 03 of 2024.



WEB COPY



A.D. JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

klt

CRL.OP.No.901 of 2025

22.01.2025