



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.29478 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 30.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.29478 of 2025

1.Ganesan
2.Sanjiv
3.Rajendran

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Veeraganur, Salem.
Crime No.123 of 2025

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.123 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For petitioners : Mr.S.Sudhanthiran
For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER



Crl.O.P.No.29478 of 2025

WEB COPY

The petitioners herein apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3), 303(2), 21(1) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, and Section 21(1) of the Mines and Mineral Act, 1957, in Crime No.123 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they have joined hands with other accused, attempted to involve in loading and unloading of soil from the Puliyanurichi Lake by using Tractor and JCB, the same was objected by the de facto complainant and others. Due to which, the petitioners have joined together, abused and assaulted the de facto complainant and his brother with iron rod and caused severe injuries.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioners are ready and willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the



Crl.O.P.No.29478 of 2025

respondent police reiterated the prosecution and submitted that the investigation in this case is pending.

5. Heard the learned counsels on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. This Court had already dismissed the anticipatory bail application of the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.22831 of 2025, dated 25.09.2025, by stating the following reasons:

“4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and reported that all the above accused names were mentioned in the FIR and they have attacked the defacto complainant and others, since they are objected to take the soil from the Puliyanurichi lake. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the manner in which the occurrence had taken place and the fact that they were involved in illegal transportation of sand from the lake by using JCB and Tractor and when it was objected by the defacto complainant and others, the petitioners have attacked the defacto complainant and others and also caused damage to ecology, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.”

K.RAJASEKAR, J.



Crl.O.P.No.29478 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and taking into account that this Court, by order dated 25.09.2025, had already dismissed Crl.O.P.No.22831 of 2025 filed by the petitioner, and this is the second anticipatory bail petition with no change in circumstances, this Court is not inclined to reconsider the same.

8. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

30.10.2025

cda

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Veeraganur, Salem.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.29478 of 2025