



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.10.2025

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

**Crl.O.P.No.22085 of 2025**

T.Elavarasan

... Petitioner

Vs.

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Chengam Police Station,  
Thiruvannamalai District – 606601.

2. The State, rep by its  
Inspector of Police,  
Chengam Police Station,  
Chengam, Tamil Nadu – 606701.

3. R.Selvi

4. Ashok Kumar  
(Crime No.265 of 2025)

... Respondent

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya  
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the Petitioner/Accused on bail in Crime  
No.265 of 2025 pending on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.M.Muralidharan

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side),  
For R1 & R2.  
Mr.S.Karthikeyan, For R3 & R4.



## **ORDER**

The petitioner herein apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) & 351(3) of BNS, 2023 r/w Sections 3(1)(r), 3(1)(a) and 3(1)(va) of the SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocities Act), 1989 in Crime No.265 of 2025, registered on the file of the respondent, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 30.06.2025, the petitioner allegedly threatened the defacto complainant's son in relation to the land leased from one Uma. It is further alleged that on 01.07.2025 accused namely Ram, Murugan, Palani Sekar and others, acting at the instigation of the petitioner, abused the defacto complainant's son with caste slurs, assaulted him, and criminally intimidated his family. On 02.07.2025, the same group is said to have blocked the pathway to the leased land, and when the defacto complainant's son questioned them, a false case was lodged against him. During the course of enquiry, Ram Prathap and Pugazhenthhi also abused him. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, although the petitioner has been arrayed as A1, no ingredients of the SC/ST Act are made out. He further contended that an earlier case is already pending against the



petitioner, and the present complaint, lodged by A5/Ram Kumar, is only a counter blast to the said case. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the investigation has revealed that the entire occurrence took place due to the instigation of the petitioner, and other accused attacked the defacto complainant and caused severe injuries. It was further submitted that the petitioner also called the defacto complainant through the phone and abused her with the intention of caste discrimination. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the averments made in the FIR and the fact that the petitioner is the main accused, he is the one who abetted others commit attack on the victim based on caste discrimination, offence under SC.ST act is made out against this petitioner, hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

WEB COPY

29.10.2025

kmm

To

1. The Deputy Superintendent of Police,  
Chengam Police Station,  
Thiruvannamalai District – 606601.

2. The State, rep by its  
Inspector of Police,  
Chengam Police Station,  
Chengam, Tamil Nadu – 606701.

3. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

kmm

Crl.O.P.No.22085 of 2025

29.10.2025