



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.25568 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.25568 of 2025

1.Murugan

2.Murugasamy

... Petitioners

Vs.

1.The State Rep. by

The Deputy Superintendent of Police,

O/o.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,

Palladam, Tiruppur.

2.The State Rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Palladam Police Station,

Tiruppur.

(Cr.No.921 of 2025)

3. Sugeetha

... Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest in Cr.No.921 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.P.Thinesh

For RR1 & 2 : Mr.S.Udayakumar

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For R3 : Mr.K.Govi Ganesan

ORDER



The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence **under Section 296(b), 316(2), 351(2) & 126(2) of BNS r/w Section 3(1)(r) & 3(1)(s) of SC/ST (Prevention of Atrocity) Act in Crime No.921 of 2025**, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners obtained machineries from the defacto complainant for rental basis and subsequently rent not paid and when the same was demanded by the defacto complainant, the petitioners abused him by calling his caste name in the public place and also criminally intimidated him. Hence, the case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the matter is purely a civil in nature and the total amount involved in this case is about Rs.30 lakhs apart from that, it is only a money dispute. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. However, the petitioners are not able to satisfy this Court that how this anticipatory bail is maintainable in view of Section 18 of the SC & ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989.

5. I have carefully considered the submissions made on both sides and also perused the FIR.

6. On perusal of FIR, it has been categorically averred that the petitioners received machineries from the defacto complainant for rental basis



Crl.OP.No.25568 of 2025

and after using the machineries failed to pay the huge amount of Rs.30,00,000/-. When the defacto complainant demanded back, the petitioners abused the defacto complainant by calling his caste name in a public place and also criminally threatened him. Since, the case involved in the offence of SC & ST (Prevention of Atrocities) Act, 1989, and the same is not registered based on any private vendetta, this Court is of the view that the present petition is not maintainable.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

26.09.2025

ssi

To:

1.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
O/o.The Deputy Superintendent of Police,
Palladam, Tiruppur.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

ssi



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.25568 of 2025

Crl.O.P.No.25568 of 2025

26.09.2025