

Arul Murugan Vs The State, rep. by the

Arul Murugan Vs The State, rep. by the

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1427047

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Feb-27-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Rajasekar

Appeal No. : CRL OP/4872/2026

Appellant : Arul Murugan

Respondent : The State, rep. by the

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR CrI.O.P.No.4872 of 2026 Arul Murugan ... Petitioner Vs. The State Rep by Inspector of Police, Keevalur Police Station, Nagapattinam District. ... Respondent
PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the event of his arrest, in connection with Cr.No.652 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police. For Petitioner : Mr.J.Jawahar For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2) of BNS r/w Section 21(1) of the Mines and Minerals(Development & Regulation) Act, 1957 in Crime No.652 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegations against the petitioner is that the petitioner was found in illegal transportation of 3 units of river sand, which led to the registration of the case. Hence, the present petition for anticipatory bail.

3. Earlier, this Court vide order dated 02.12.2025 in CrI.OP.No.32162

of 2025 dismissed the petition on the following reasons: 6. Considering the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioner and this petitioner involved in damaging ecology by illegal quarrying the sand, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners

marriage is likely to be held in the month of April 2026 and the sand seized in this case is not river sand, it is only gravel sand. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation and hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that from the river Vettaru, the sand was taken, thereby, the petitioner herein was involved in damaging ecology and waterbodies by illegal quarrying the sand . Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have gone through the earlier order, on merits, this Court has

dismissed the earlier order. Now, there is no change of circumstances after the dismissal of the earlier order. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. 27.02.2026 Vv To

1. The District Munsif and Judicial Magistrate, Keevalur

2. The Inspector of Police, Keevalur Police Station, Nagapattinam District. 3.The Public Prosecutor High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv Crl.O.P.No.4872 of 2026 27.02.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com