

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT AT SRIVILLIPUTTUR.

Present: **Thiru.A.Kanthakumar, M.L.,**
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputtur.

Dated this the 11th day of June 2026, Thursday.

Cr.M.P. No.1586/2026

Vadivel (A3)

... Petitioner/Accused.

/ Vs /

State through the Forest Range Officer
Rajapalayam Forest Range
WLOR.No.14/2025

U/s. 2(1), 2(11), 2(14), 2(16), 2(20), 2(36), 2(37), 9, 39,
44, 49A, 49B, 50, 51, 52, 57 of Wild Life Protection Act.

... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.G.Neekathalingam, Advocate for the petitioner and Thiru.S.Thirumalaiappan, Public Prosecutor for the respondent and upon hearing the argument of both sides, this court made the following

ORDER

It is an application for bail u/s.483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS)

FIR was registered against the petitioner/A3 for the offences u/s. 2(1), 2(11), 2(14), 2(16), 2(20), 2(36), 2(37), 9, 39, 44, 49A, 49B, 50, 51, 52, 57 of Wild Life Protection Act. The occurrence happened on 08-11-2025 and the petitioner arrested on NBW and he is under custody for the past 27 days from 12-05-2026.

As per FIR, on information, on 08-11-2025 at about 9-45 am the forest officials were on raid at Rajapalayam, Kuthapanchan river bund to arrest the persons who are sharing the deer meat. At that time, the petitioner and other accused were cutting and sharing the deer meat and on seeing the respondent officials they were escaped from that place. The respondent officials surrounded the petitioner and recovered deer meat weighing about 27 kgs. Hence, this case.

The learned counsel for petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any such offence and prays to grant bail to the petitioner on any condition. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that if the petitioner is released on bail he would commit similar types of offences again and hence he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

Heard both sides. Records perused. A perusal of the records reveals that the petitioner has been in judicial custody for the past 30 days. The prosecution case is that the petitioner, along with the other accused, unlawfully entered the forest area, hunted a wild animal, namely a deer (chital), and shared its meat among themselves.

The learned Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the grant of bail on the ground that the petitioner had earlier been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of the Madras High Court in CrI.O.P. (MD) No. 20259 of 2025, dated 17.11.2025. However, the petitioner failed to comply with the bail conditions regularly. Consequently, the respondent filed a petition for cancellation of anticipatory bail in Cr.M.P. No. 194 of 2026 before the Judicial Magistrate, Rajapalayam. The anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner was subsequently cancelled, and pursuant to the execution of a Non-Bailable Warrant (NBW), he was arrested on 12.05.2026 and has since been in custody. The learned Public Prosecutor further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and that the final report/charge sheet has not yet been filed.

Per contra, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had originally been granted anticipatory bail by the Hon'ble High Court and that the alleged violation of the bail condition was only minor in nature. It was further submitted that, following the cancellation of anticipatory bail by the Judicial Magistrate, Rajapalayam, the petitioner has remained in custody for the past 30 days. Therefore, the petitioner may be enlarged on bail subject to appropriate conditions.

Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court finds that the allegations against the petitioner pertain to offences punishable under the Wildlife (Protection) Act, 1972 and the Forest Act. The prosecution alleges that the petitioner hunted a chital (spotted deer), an animal protected under the Schedule III of the Wildlife (Protection) Act. The offence is serious in nature. Further, the petitioner had previously been granted anticipatory bail but failed to comply with the conditions imposed, resulting in the cancellation of the said bail. The investigation is also at a crucial stage and has not yet been completed. Having regard to the gravity and seriousness of the offence, the conduct of the petitioner in violating the bail conditions, and the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the bail petition is dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 11th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The Forest Range Officer, Rajapalayam Forest Range.