



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **29.10.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.27838 of 2025

1.K.Vasudevan
2.V.Nittilakshan
3.K.N.Krishnan
4.T.E.Srinivasan

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Inspector of Police,
B-2, Vishnu Kanchi Police Station,
Kanchipuram.
(Crime No.224 of 2025)

.. Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest by the respondent police in Crime No.224 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.V.Raghavachari, Senior Advocate for Mr.A.K.Samy for P1 & P2.
	:	Mr.Satish Parasaran, Senior Advocate for Mr.A.K.Samy for P3 & P4.
For Respondent	:	Mr.S.Udaya Kumar, Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For Intervener	:	Ms.BA.Nalini



ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 193(2), 296(b), 132, 351(2), 79 BNS r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 in Crime No.224 of 2025 seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution as per the defacto complainant, who is the Executive Officer of the temple, is that on 02.10.2025, during the Thuppul Vedanta Desikar Mangala Sasanam Festival at Varadharaja Perumal Temple, a dispute arose between the petitioners and the defacto complainant with regard to the recitation of various Prabandhams. It is alleged that the petitioners quarreled with her, abused her, and also threatened her with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned Senior Counsels for the petitioners submitted that the defacto complainant attempted to stop recitation of Prabandhams, and the petitioners only objected to the same. He further submitted that the petitioners did not abuse or use any filthy language against the defacto complainant. He further submitted that there always been clashes and differences between two groups in the temple, and since the petitioners intervened, the present occurrence has taken place. Hence, he prays to



grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that the petitioners have been regularly preventing the defacto complainant from discharging her official duties. She further submitted that if this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, they may be directed to stay away from the temple premises to avoid further disturbance. Hence, she opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners have been habitually involved in obstructing and quarreling with the other group of temple devotees. He further submitted that there is long standing dispute between these two groups and that the petitioners are having previous cases of similar nature. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the fact that the dispute is arising out of long-standing enmity



between two groups of persons doing temple festivities with regard to the recitation of Prabandhams. Though it is alleged that, the petitioners threatening the officer while she was on duty, no serious overt act has been attributed against them. Since the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the *learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Kanchipuram*, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a 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 respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of



WEB COPY



one week and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action 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 Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

29.10.2025

drl

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Kanchipuram.

2. The Inspector of Police,
B-2, Vishnu Kanchi Police Station,
Kanchipuram.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl

CRL.O.P.No.27838 of 2025

(2/2)

29.10.2025