



CRL OP NO. 1443 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-01-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP NO. 1443 of 2025

Kamaraj
S/O. Velayutham, No.1/158. Mel Vinayagapuram,
Pattabiramanapuram, Thiruvallur District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep By
Inspector of Police, Thiruttani Police Station, Thiruvallur District.
(Crime No.1097 of 2024)

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s):

Muthamizh Selvakumar P
A.Esakupandy
S.Ramesh Kumar
M.Jithendran
V.Surya Prakash
A.Vivek

For Respondent(s):

S.Santhosh
Government Advocate (criminal Side)
Madras High Court.

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 324(4), 351(3) of BNS 2023 in Crime No.1097 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to produce solvent sureties and to abide with any conditions that may be imposed by this Court, therefore, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. The case of the prosecution as put forth by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police who is opposing for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner is that on 07.12.2024, the petitioner and his brother attacked the defacto complainant in his head with iron rod due to the previous enmity between them, in which, the defacto complainant sustained head injury. He further submitted that there are three previous pending as against the petitioner.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stating that the petitioner along with co-accused attacked the husband of the de facto complainant and caused grievous injury. He further submitted that the investigation is in the initial stage.



5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Advocate de) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record including the FIR.

WEB COPY

6. Taking note of the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and taking note of the fact that the petitioner has three previous cases and also the fact that the petitioner and the other accused caused grievous injury on the defacto complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

22-01-2025

msv
To
The Inspector of Police,
Thiruttani Police Station,
Thiruvallur District.