



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 18428 of 2026

Rajadurai,
S/o Thirugnanamurugavel

..Petitioner/
Accused-3

Vs

The State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Muthandikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
Crime.No. 77/2026

..Respondent/
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023 to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime
No. 77 of 2026 on the file of respondent police in the event of his arrest.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Chandrasekar Sundarraj.

For Respondent(s): Mr.N.Palanivel
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections
191(2), 191(3), 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) and 109 of BNS, 2023 in
Crime No.77 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2.It is case of the prosecution that on the date of occurrence, the petitioner
along with other accused persons crossed the two wheeler drove by the defacto




complainant's sister son, which was hit by them. This was questioned by the defacto complainant's sister son, the petitioners allegedly restrained his vehicle and abused and attacked him. After knowing this , the defacto complainant went to the spot , questioned him, thereby the petitioners abused them in filthy language, assaulted them and criminally intimidated them with dire consequences and caused sever injury to them . Hence the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is no way connected to this case and has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police submits that the petitioner has seven (7) previous cases of similar nature pending against him. He further submits that if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, he may abscond and commit similar offences in future as well. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and also perused the records available.



6.From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is seen that the petitioner has got seven previous cases of similar nature, which clearly demonstrates that whenever he was granted bail by the Courts, he has misused the liberty granted to him. In view of the same, if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, he may be emboldened to indulge in similar offences in future without fear of law. Hence, taking into consideration of interest of the society at large, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7.Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

15-07-2026

jrs



To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Muthandikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
Crime.No. 77/2026

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.18428 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

jrs

CRL OP No. 18428 of 2026

15-07-2026