



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.16381 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.06.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.16381 of 2026

1.Mr.H.Jayavel
2.Mr.H.Arjunun
3.Mr.H.Vignesh

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The Superintendent of Police,
District Police Office,
Collectorate Campus,
Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu – 635 001.

2.State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Maharajakadai Police Station,
Krishnagiri District – 635 001.

3.Mr.Samudi

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.150 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.V.Senthil Kumar

For Respondents : Mrs.R.S.Indira,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



Crl.O.P.No.16381 of 2026

ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 49 of BNS and Section 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) (va) of SC/ST Act, in Crime No.150 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 08.06.2026, the petitioners, while extracting clay from Thambu Kuttai Lake near Aathukavai, Kallakuruthu Panchayat, abused the de facto complainant in filthy language and attempted to assault him. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and that they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed the anticipatory bail on the ground that there are totally seven accused in this case. She further submitted that, as against the



Crl.O.P.No.16381 of 2026

third petitioner, six previous cases are pending, the fourth petitioner has two previous cases, and the first and second petitioners have no previous cases. It is further contended that when the de facto complainant objected to the unauthorised activities of the petitioners, they allegedly gave an electric shock to the de facto complainant, who was thereafter admitted to the hospital.

5. Considering the nature and gravity of the allegations, particularly the allegation that the petitioners caused an electric shock to the de facto complainant, this Court is of the firm view that, if the petitioners are enlarged on anticipatory bail, it would jeopardise the prosecution case. Further, since the case arising out of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act and there is a bar under Section 18 of the said Act, the present application for anticipatory bail is not maintainable and liable to be dismissed.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

29.06.2026

cda



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.16381 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Krishnagiri.
- 2.The Superintendent of Police,
District Police Office,
Collectorate Campus,
Krishnagiri, Tamil Nadu – 635 001.
- 3.The Inspector of Police,
Maharajakadai Police Station,
Krishnagiri District – 635 001.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.OP.No.16381 of 2026

29.06.2026