



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 26474 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 26474 of 2025

1. Pasumai Valavan @ Agri Ka Pasumai
Valavan
S/o. Kasinatha, No. 36, No. 3/2039, 2nd
Cross Street, Madhanandapuram,
Mugulivakkam, Kancheepuram - 600
125. and 2 Others

2. Radhakrishnan
S/o. Perumal, Main Road Street,
Arulmozhidevan Eyyalur,
Kattumannarkovil, Cuddalore - 608304.

3. Pandiyan
S/o. Pavadai, Main Road Street,
Arulmozhidevan Eyyalur,
Kattumannarkovil, Cuddalore - 608
304.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State rep by its, The Inspector of
Police,
Kattumannarkoil police Station,
Cuddalore District. (Crime No.224 of
2025)

Respondent(s)



PRAYER

To enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest by respondent police in Crime No. 224 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police and pass the other appropriate order to secure the ends of justice and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Arasu Ganesan
M.S.Akash Daniel
A.Dominic Johnson
M.A.Gokul

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 132 and 251(2) of BNS in Crime No.224 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that while a Government scheme was being implemented in the Kattumannarkoil Eyannur Village, they intervened and disrupted the scheme. Although the Tahsildar attempted to intervene and pacified them, A1 pushed and abused the officer. Hence, the complaint.



WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have not committed the offences alleged by the defacto complainant. He also submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide with any conditions that may be imposed by this Court, and therefore, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police, reported that during the execution of the scheme by the Tamilnadu Government, the petitioners came in the ladies queue, picked a quarrel and pushed the defacto complainant. The 1st petitioner has 5 previous cases of a similar nature against him. He further submitted that there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners 2 and 3. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the specific overtact attributed against the 1st petitioner and that he has 5 previous cases of a similar nature, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to him. As for as petitioners 2 and 3 concerned, since they have



no previous cases, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners 2 and 3 are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned District Judicial Magistrate, Kattumannarkovil**, on condition that **the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)**, each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) **The petitioners 2 and 3 shall report before the**



WEB COPY

respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

25-09-2025

mpa

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



To

1. The District Judicial Magistrate, Kattumannarkovil.

2.State rep by its, The Inspector of
Police,
Kattumannarkoil police Station,
Cuddalore District. (Crime No.224 of
2025)

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 26474 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.

mpa

**CRL OP No. 26474 of
2025**

25-09-2025