



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 16530 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL OP No. 16530 of 2025

B.Shiva

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State rep by its, Inspector of Police,
Krishnagiri Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri District. (Crime No.88 of
2025)

Respondent(s)

PRAYER


This Criminal Original Petition is filed to enlarge the Petitioner on bail in the event of the arrest in Crime No.88 of 2025 on the file of the Respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.P.Saravanan

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Vinoth Raja GA (crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS 2023 and subsequently altered to Sections 296(b), 109(1) of BNS 2023 subsequently altered to Sections 103(1) of BNS 2023 (302 of IPC) in Crime



No.88 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The prosecution's case stems from a complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, alleging that her son Yuvaraj was fatally injured in a fight with the petitioner, and other accused on February 15, 2025, following a dispute over an auto ride near the Bharathidasan street Junction of Thiruvannamalai Road, which ultimately led to Yuvaraj's hospitalization and death. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and has been falsely implicated in this case. Learned counsel further submits that petitioner is ready to abide any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stating that the investigation in this case is at crucial stage and if the petitioner is granted anticipatory, there is a



possibilities of tampering the witnesses and hampering the investigation.

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the objection raised by the learned Government Advocate, the stage of investigation and the overact leveled against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief sought for by the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

12.06.2025

jai

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Krishnagiri Town Police Station,
Krishnagiri District.

2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Krishnagiri.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 16530 of 2025





WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 16530 of 2025



M.NIRMAL KUMAR J.

jai

**CRL OP No. 16530 of
2025**

12.06.2025