



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P. No.17160 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.06.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P. No.17160 of 2025

G. Chetan Thapa

... Petitioner/ Accused No.3

Vs.

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Maduranthakam PEW Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
(Crime No.230 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, pleased to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest by the respondent police concerned in Crime No.230 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr. Balamurugan Paramanayagam

For Respondent : Mr. R. Vinothraja
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



Crl.O.P. No.17160 of 2025

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 4(1)(A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition (Amendment) Act, 2024 and under Section 4(1)(aaa) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition Act in Crime No.230 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that while the respondent police were on their routine patrol duty, they found that the accused persons/ A1 and A2 were involved in illegal transportation of liquor (768 bottles of Kingfisher beer each containing 500 ml) from Puducherry in a car bearing Registration No.TN-01-Z-6831; that upon investigation, A1 confessed that the petitioner, who is running a restaurant at Sriperumbudur insisted them to purchase the aforesaid liquor from Puducherry. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case, based on the confession of the co-accused and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution; that the petitioner was not present at the scene of



occurrence; and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court and sought for anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and on instruction submitted that the petitioner is arrayed as A3 in this case; that the petitioner was involved in smuggling liquor from Puducherry regularly and he has six previous cases of similar nature; and that the investigation is pending and opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of allegation against the petitioner, the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side, the fact that the petitioner has bad antecedents of similar nature and the investigation is pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P. No.17160 of 2025

M. NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

stn

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

19.06.2025

stn

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Maduranthakam PEW Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
(Crime No.230 of 2025)
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P. No.17160 of 2025