



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.8904 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No.8904 of 2026

Pradeep,
S/o.Devaraj,
No.5/2 G D Colony,
Krishnarayapuram,
Ganapathy,
Coimbatore – 641 006.

...Petitioner/A3

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by,
Inspector of Police,
CSCID Coimbatore Police Station.
Coimbatore.
(Crime No.68 of 2026)

...Respondent/
Complainant

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail, in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 68 of 2026 on the file of the Inspector of Police, CSCID Coimbatore Police Station, Coimbatore.

For Petitioner: Mr.A.Nagarajan

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

ORDER

The petitioner/A3, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 4(1)(b), 7(1)(a), 7(1)(b), and 7(1)(C) of the Liquefied Petroleum Gas



(Regulation of Supply and Distribution) order 2000 r/w 7(1)(a)(ii) of the Essential Commodities Act, 1955, in Crime No.68 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner/A3, along with the other accused, illegally stored 997 commercial LPG cylinders for selling at a higher price. Hence, the case.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner/A3 and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the respondent.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the third accused, and there are about four accused. It is the specific submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that they have been running only the bottling unit and the question of the black marketing of gas does not arise at all.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A3 would further submit that since they have been doing a bottling of the commercial gas, it is their responsibility to keep all the cylinders, and as and when the bottling is



completed, the same would be sent out. Therefore, the question of accusing the petitioner/A3 does not arise at all. Hence, he would submit that the present case has been filed under the misconception of fact and prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. However, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent would strongly oppose the anticipatory bail application on the ground that as against the first accused, the Administration has already passed a Detention Order, viz., C.NO.05/PBMMSEC.Act/IS/2026 dated 25.03.2026, and that this petitioner has got one previous case in Crime No.23 of 2025 for the offence under Sections 4(1)(b)(c) and 7(1)(a)(b)(c) of LPG order 2000 r/w 7(1)(a)(ii) of the EC Act, 1955, before the CSCID Coimbatore Unit.

7. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), this Court could able to visualize the seriousness of the issue, that too in the present scenario prevailing in the world, and apart from that, the petitioner has got one previous case of a similar nature. Therefore, it clearly demonstrates that the petitioner has been misusing the liberty granted by this Court by repeating the similar crime. Hence, this Court is of the firm view that the petitioner does not deserve the anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

09-04-2026

dk

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate – IV,
Coimbatore.
2. The Inspector of Police,
CSCID Coimbatore Police Station.
Coimbatore.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.8904 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

dk

CRL OP No. 8904 of 2026

09-04-2026