



CRL OP(MD). No.22929 of 2024

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 27/12/2024

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL
CRL OP(MD). No.22929 of 2024

Chidhambaram Alias Kutty

... Petitioner/ Accused No.1

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
Ammamet Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(Crime No.955 of 2024.)

... Respondent/ Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Kathivelu, Senior Counsel
for Mr.Prabhu, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.Sakthi Kumar,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Section 482 of B.N.S.S, 2023

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 126(2), 131, 308(5), 140(3) & 351(3) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.955 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the Defeacto Complainant and his friend



CRL OP(MD). No.22929 of 2024

WEB COPY

of Ramanaguru are worked together in a company. At the request of Ramanaguru, the Defacto-complainant to recover salary due from KKG finance company, decided to engage the accused No.2. When the second accused went to threaten the employer of the said Ramanaguru to pay the arrear salary, a case has been registered against him and hence the second accused demanded money to look after the criminal case and the said Ramanaguru gave a sum of Rs.1,50,000/-. Thereafter, the second accused demanded additional money from the defacto-complainant and his friend and hence both of them met the present petitioner and requested the petitioner to seek additional time for a period of 20 days, likewise the petitioner also sought 20 days time to the defacto-complainant. Thereafter, they were unable to arrange the money and hence once again they met this petitioner and requested him to seek additional time. At that time all other accused persons came to the petitioner's house and all of them abused the defacto-complainant using filthy language and threatened the Defacto-complainant. Further, the accused persons said to have taken some money from the defacto-complainant's pocket. Hence, the case.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person, he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted



CRL OP(MD). No.22929 of 2024

that the petitioner is law-abiding citizen and he is ready and willing to furnish substantial sureties and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court; therefore, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that, the Defecto Complainant and his friend of Ramanaguru are worked together in a company. At the request of Ramanaguru, the Defacto-complainant to recover his salary due from KKG finance company. Hence the defacto-complainant decided to engage the accused No.2 to recover the salary due. When the second accused went to threaten the employer of the said Ramanaguru to pay the arrear salary, a case has been registered against him and hence the second accused demanded money to look after the criminal case and the said Ramanaguru gave a sum of Rs.1,50,000/-. Thereafter, the second accused demanded additional money from the defacto-complainant and his friend and hence both of them met the present petitioner and requested the petitioner to seek additional time for a period of 20 days. Thereafter, they were unable to arrange the money and thereby all other accused persons came to the petitioner's house in a car bearing registration No. TN-55-PY-2527 and all of them abused the defacto-complainant using filthy language and threatened the Defacto-complainant. Further, the accused persons said to have taken some money from the defacto-complainant's



CRL OP(MD). No.22929 of 2024

WEB COPY

pocket. He further submitted that there are so many previous cases pending as against the petitioner. The investigation is not yet completed. The charges levelled against the accused persons are grave in nature. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel on both side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the representation made by both sides, money dispute is pending between the parties, the nature of offences are grave in nature, though nobody was injured, there are so many previous cases pending as against the petitioner and already co-accused were arrested and they are still in custody, and the investigation is not yet completed, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. Therefore, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
27/12/2024

/ TRUE COPY /

/12/2024
Sub-Assistant Registrar
(C.S.I / II / III / IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

GVN



CRL OP(MD). No.22929 of 2024

To கனம் உரிமை

WEB COPY

1.The Inspector of Police,
Ammamet Police Station,
Thanjavur District.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.22929 of 2024

Date :27/12/2024

ED/ SKN /SAR- (31/12/2024) 5P / 3C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing certified copies in this format from
17/07/2023