



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.9135 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.9135 of 2026

Mr.M.Pratheepraj, S/o.Marudhamuthu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep. By

The Inspector of Police,

Ramanatham Police Station,

Cuddalore District.

(Crime No.278 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482(1) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in Crime No.278 of 2025 dated 26.11.2025 on the file of the Ramanatham Police Station, Cuddalore, the respondent herein.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Logeshwaran

For Respondent : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner herein apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2), 326(a) of BNS Act, 2023 read with Section 21(1) of Mines and Mineral Development & Regulation) Act, in Crime No.278 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was in possession of ½ unit of river sand. Hence, the complaint.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. It was further submitted that the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation and abide by any other stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for the 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 two previous cases of a similar nature. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

6. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is seen that the petitioner has got two previous cases of similar nature, which clearly demonstrates that whenever he was granted bail by the



Crl.O.P.No.9135 c

Courts, he has misused the liberty granted to him. In view of the same, if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he may be emboldened to indulge in similar offences in future without fear of law. Hence, taking into consideration of interest of the society at large, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original petition is dismissed.

10.04.2026

mp

To

1. The Inspector of Police, Ramanatham Police Station, Cuddalore District.
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.9135 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

mp

Crl.OP.No.9135 of 2026

10.04.2026