



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.Nos.15338 & 15453 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 23.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

Crl.O.P.Nos.15338 & 15453 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.Nos.11782&11786 of 2025

Mohanraj.C ... Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.15338 of 2025

S.Tamizhselvi ... Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.15453 of 2025

Vs.

State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Virinchipuram Police Station,
Vellore District.

... Respondent in both Crl.O.Ps

Common Prayer : Criminal Original Petitions have been filed under Section 482 of BNSS to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.86 of 2025 pending on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.15338 of 2025 : Mr.D.Prasanna Kumar

For Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.15453 of 2025 : Mr.M.L.Ramesh

For Respondent in both Crl.O.Ps : Mr.R.Vinothraja
Govt. Advocate (Crl Side)

For Intervener in both Crl.O.Ps : Mr.E.Kannadasan



COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners/A1 & A2, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent Police for the offences under Section 3 of the TN Public Property (Prevention of Damage and Loss) Act, 1992, in Crime No.86 of 2025 on the file of the respondent, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant is the tenant and the petitioner/A2 in Crl.O.P.No.15453 of 2025 is the land lord. Due to the landlord and tenant dispute, A2 along with other accused had demolished the shops constructed by the de facto complainant in her land without the consent of the de facto complainant. Hence the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and due to previous enmity, a false complaint has been given against the petitioners. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed on them. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and opposed for



grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. Learned counsel appearing for the intervener/de facto complainant submitted that the accused had caused loss to the de facto complainant to the tune of Rs.30 lakhs by demolishing the building constructed by him. Hence, he strongly opposed for granting anticipatory bail.

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, though this Court suggested that the petitioners to deposit the amount towards the loss caused to the de facto complainant, the petitioners are not ready to deposit the same.

8. In view of the above, this Court finds that the custody of the petitioners is very much required in this case, thereby, not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.Nos.15338 & 15453 of 2025



G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN, J.

ham

9. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions stand dismissed.

Consequently, connected miscellaneous petitions are closed.

23.06.2025

ham

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate - IV,
Vellore District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Virinchipuram Police Station,
Vellore District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

**Crl.O.P.Nos.15338 & 15453 of 2025
and Crl.M.P.Nos.11782&11786 of 2025**