



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.29973 of 2025

T.Rajesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
C.S.C.I.D., Salem.
(Crime No.317 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 the Crime No.317 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.Dharani Thirunavukkarasu

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

ORDER



The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 6(4) of the Tamil Nadu Scheduled Commodities (Regulation of Distribution by Card System) Order, 1982 read with Section 7(1)(a)(ii) of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955 in Crime No. 317 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was involved in the collection and transportation of 2,800 kilograms of rice meant for the Public Distribution System (PDS). The police intercepted the vehicle in which A1 was transporting the said rice and subsequently seized the same. Based on the statement recorded from A1, it was revealed that A2 had procured the rice from Omalur, Dharapuram and Kamalapuram areas and that it was being transported for delivery to A3, the petitioner herein. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been implicated solely on the basis of the confession of the co-accused, wherein it was alleged that he was the person intended to



receive the transported rice. He further submitted that the petitioner is willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court.

Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioner has bad antecedents, with seven previous cases already pending and one case was under investigation. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, and taking into account the fact that the investigation reveals that the petitioner is the person who intended to receive the 'Rice', coupled with the pendency of seven previous cases against him and that the investigation is



still pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

10.11.2025

drl

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
C.S.C.I.D., Salem.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.29973 of 2025

10.11.2025