

Suresh Vs State Rep.by

Suresh Vs State Rep.by

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1433920

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Mar-23-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice C.Kumarappan

Appeal No. : CRL OP/7294/2026

Appellant : Suresh

Respondent : State Rep.by

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN Suresh S/o.Velu, No.126, Pillaiyar Koil Street, Enthal Pallikondapattu, ..Petitioner(s) Vs State Rep.by The Inspector of Police, ..Respondent(s) PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest pending in Crime No. 54 of 2025 on the file of the Respondent. For Petitioner(s): S.L.Venkatesan For Respondent(s): Mr.P.Dhileepan Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 4(1)(a), 4(i) r/w. 4(1)(c), 4(1)(A) of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition (Amendment) Act, 2024 in Crime No.54 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail. Page1 of 4

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner was found in illegal possession of 17 nos of Tasmac bottles (each containing 180 ml) with intention to sell the same to the public; hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in this case. He would submit that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. 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 submitted that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made on either side.

6. This anticipatory bail petition arises out of offences under the Prohibition Act, which have an impact on society. The learned counsel for the Page2 of 4 petitioner would submit that the petitioner had legally purchased the liquor. However, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that, out of 17 bottles, only 4 were legally purchased.

7. Though the petitioner has no previous case, considering that he has been charged under the Prohibition Act, this Court is of the view that granting anticipatory bail in such cases may embolden him to commit similar offences in

future.

8. Considering the nature of the allegations, this Court is of the view that the petitioner does not deserve the grant of anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. MPA To 1.The Inspector of Police,

2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras. Page3 of 4

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

MPA Page4 of 4

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