



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.27563 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.27563 of 2025

1.K.Arjunan

2.S.Sathyaseelan

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Peranamallur Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District – 604 503.
Crime No.49 of 2025

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.49 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For petitioners : Mr.P.Praveen Kumar

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioners herein apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 74



Crl.O.P.No.27563 of 2025

WEB COPY

and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.49 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. This Court, by order dated 19.03.2023, in Crl.O.P.No.7717 of 2025 granted anticipatory bail to the petitioners, which reads as follows:

2. The case of the prosecution is that, a wordy quarrel arose between the petitioners and de facto complainant; and that the petitioners attacked the de facto complainant and thus, committed the aforesaid offence.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the allegations are false; and that in any case, custodial interrogation is not required and sought for anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police, while opposing the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners, reiterated the prosecution case and on instructions submitted that injured has been discharged from the hospital. He further submitted that the petitioners have no bad antecedents.

5. Considering the nature of the allegations, the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital, the petitioners have no bad antecedents and since custodial interrogation is not required for the purpose of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

3. It is stated that thereafter, the petitioners filed a petition seeking extension of time in Crl.M.P.No.11840 of 2025 in Crl.O.P.No.7717 of 2025, and the same was allowed by this Court by order dated 09.07.2025.



Crl.O.P.No.27563 of 2025

4. In view of the above facts, it is evident that the petitioners, though granted anticipatory bail earlier and even granted an extension of time to comply with the conditions imposed, failed to utilize the same. The petitioners have now filed the present anticipatory bail petition seeking the very same relief. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

09.10.2025

cda

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Pernampet Police Station,
Pernampet, Vellore District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

3/4



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.27563 of 2025

cda

Crl.O.P.No.27563 of 2025

09.10.2025