



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.29253 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.29253 of 2025

1.Ponnusamy
2.Magesh

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State Rep by
The Forest Range Officer,
Sathyamangalam Forest Range,
Erode District.
(S.W.O.R. No.1 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with S.W.O.R. No.1 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.J.Ranjith Kumar

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 36A and 36E of the Tamil Nadu Forest Act, 1882, Sections 2 and 3 of the Tamil Nadu Timber Transit Rules, 1968 and Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the Tamil Nadu Sandalwood



Transit Rules, 1967, in S.W.O.R. No. 1 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they are ranked as A3 and A4 in this case. It is alleged that the petitioners, in collusion with A1 and A2, were involved in the possession and transportation of 519 kilograms of sandalwood, which was purchased from A5. While A1 and A2 were transporting the said sandalwood, the respondent police intercepted them and arrested A1, A2, and A5 along with the contraband. Hence, the present case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners were arrayed as accused only based on the statements recorded from the arrested accused. Hence, he prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the first petitioner is the father and the second petitioner is the son, and that the contraband was transported in the Bolero car based on their instructions. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending. It was also submitted that petitioner/A3 has three previous cases of a similar nature and



is a habitual offender, whereas petitioner/A4 has no previous antecedents.

Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

6. Considering the nature of the allegations, the fact that the investigation is still pending, and that the petitioners are father and son, and the father having three previous cases, this Court is of the view that if anticipatory bail is granted at this stage, the petitioners may indulge in similar activities. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

10.11.2025

drl

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



Crl.OP.No.29253 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Chetpet Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

Crl.O.P.No.29253 of 2025

10.11.2025