



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6594 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.6594 of 2026

Ramalingam

... Petitioner

Vs.

State By,
The Inspector of Police,
Tatchampattu Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.
(Crime No.124 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest pending investigation in Crime No.124 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.S.Silambuselvan
For Respondent	:	Mr.P.Dhileepan
		Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence **under Sections 303(2), 329(3), 324(4), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.124 of 2025**, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner was illegally



taken away 200 lorries of red sand from the patta land belongs to the defacto complainant, worth about Rs.14 lakhs and thereby, damaged the land and caused a huge revenue loss to the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any such offence as alleged by the defacto complainant and he has been falsely implicated in this case based on the confession of co-accused. He further submitted that he is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, would submit that the petitioner has committed a theft of red sand from the patta land and that the petitioner has named, and in the scene of occurrence there were 200 lorries, and the cost of natural resources is very huge in nature. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and also perused the materials available on record.



Crl.O.P.No.6594 of 2020

WEB COPY

6. From the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is clear that the petitioner has been named, and in the scene of occurrence 200 lorries involved, and the cost of the natural resources which was exploited by the petitioner is enormous. Considering the above submissions, this Court is of the view that exploitation of nature cannot be encouraged by granting anticipatory bail. Hence, this Court is of the firm view that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

13.03.2026

ssi

To:

1.The Inspector of Police,
Tatchampattu Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

ssi



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6594 of 2026

Crl.O.P.No.6594 of 2026

13.03.2026