



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.Nos.27087 & 27192 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 08.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.Nos.27087 & 27192 of 2025

Chinnappa Reddy

... Petitioner
in Crl.O.P.No.27087 of 2025

Rammaya A. Ballari Ramakrishnan

... Petitioner
in Crl.O.P.No.27192 of 2025

Vs.

The State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Ponnai Police Station,
Ranipet District.
(Vellore District)
Crime No.35 of 2025

... Respondent

COMMON PRAYER : Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.35 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Kannadasan
in Crl.O.P.No.27087 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Thirumoorthy
in Crl.O.P.No.27192 of 2025

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

COMMON ORDER



Crl.O.P.Nos.27087 & 27192 of 2025

The petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.27087 of 2025, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.08.2025, for the offence punishable under Section 109 of BNS 2023, [under Section 307 of IPC] and subsequently altered into Sections 103(1), 61(2) of BNS, 2023, [under Sections 302, 120(b) of IPC] in Crime No.35 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks bail.

2. The petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.27192 of 2025, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.08.2025, for the offence punishable under Section 109 of BNS 2023 @ Sections 103(1) and 61 of BNS Act, 2023, in Crime No.35 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks bail.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner/A4 in Crl.O.P.No.27192 of 2025 was having a land dispute with the deceased. It is alleged that the petitioner/A4 engaged A1 to A3 to commit the murder of the deceased. Accordingly, between 4.00 p.m. and 5.45 p.m., on the basis of conspiracy, A1 to A3 proceeded to the place of occurrence and attacked the deceased with aruval and other deadly weapons, thereby causing his death. Hence, the compliant.



WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Since the petitioner/A4 was having a land dispute with the deceased, only based on suspicion, the petitioners have been implicated in this case. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail.

5. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed the grant of bail, reiterating the prosecution case and submitted that due to the land dispute between A4 and the deceased, A4 engaged A1 to A3 by paying money, helped them, and hatched a conspiracy. Due to which, A1 to A3 went to the place of occurrence and indiscriminately attacked the deceased using Aruval, thereby committing the murder.

6. Heard the learned counsels on either side and perused the materials available on record.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the gravity of



Crl.O.P.Nos.27087 & 27192 of 2025

the offence, the manner in which the occurrence had taken place and the investigation is still pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, these criminal original petitions stand dismissed.

08.10.2025

cda

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Ponnai Police Station,
Ranipet District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.Nos.27087 & 27192 of 2025