



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.10052 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.10052 of 2026

Arun, S/o.Ramalingam

Vs.

... Petitioner

State represented by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Sheikalmudis Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
(Crime No.09 of 2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner/accused on bail in the event of arrest in connection with the FIR in Crime No.09 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police.

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

ORDER

The petitioner, herein apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under **Section 4(1)(C) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition (Amendment) Act, 2024** in **Crime No.9 of 2026**, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he was in possession of 5 sag bags containing liquor (1. 48 bottles of 180 ml Monitor Brandy, 2. 48 bottles of 180 ml Mclene Brandy, 3. 48 bottles of 180 ml of Vorion Brandy, 4. 48 b 300 bottles (180 ml) of Vorion XXX Rum, and 5. 48 bottles of 180 ml of Veeran Brandy). Hence, the complaint.

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. He 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 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 there are nine(9) previous cases pending against the petitioner. 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. Considering the quantity of liquor recovered from the petitioner and on the fact that the petitioner is having nine previous cases, this Court is of the view that enlarging the petitioner on anticipatory bail would have a serious negative impact on society. Therefore, the petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail at this stage.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original petition is dismissed.

21.04.2026

mp

To

1. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Sheikalmudis Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
2. The Judicial Magistrate, Valparai.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.10052 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

mp

Crl.OP.No.10052 of 2026

21.04.2026