



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.28851 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 24.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.28851 of 2025

1. Rajamohan
2. Ravichandran
3. Karthikeyan

... Petitioners

Vs.

State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Katpadi Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Cr.No.303 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Cr.No.303 of 2025 pending investigation on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Kannadasan

For Intervenor : Mr.M.Swathish
for M/s.Saravabhavman Associates

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udaya Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 309(4), 351(2) of BNS 2023 r/w Section 4 of Tamilnadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 in Cr.No.303 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he is the father of the defacto complainant. It is alleged that, after securing an order in his favour for retaining the property, in which the defacto complainant and her family members were residing, the petitioner went to the said property along with his henchmen, and at his instigation, the other accused persons attacked the defacto complainant and caused severe injuries, including a fracture. It is further alleged that they also demolished the house using a JCB. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had obtained an order in his favour from the Revenue Divisional Officer and that he was entitled to take possession of the property. He



further submitted that a false complaint has been lodged against the petitioner. Hence, he prayed that anticipatory bail may be granted to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor/defacto complainant submitted that this is a case of misuse of the order passed by the Revenue Divisional Officer. Though it is stated that the petitioner is entitled to remain in the property, he allegedly entered the house forcibly along with his henchmen, attacked the defacto complainant with weapons, and caused severe injuries. It is further submitted that the defacto complainant was immediately hospitalized and was only recently discharged. It is also alleged that they demolished the house using a JCB. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and reported that the investigation is still pending and that no one has been arrested so far in this case. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.28851 of 2025

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the manner in which the occurrence had taken place, and the fact that the victim, who is a lady and the daughter of the petitioner, sustained grievous injuries, and that the alleged occurrence had taken place at the instigation of the petitioner, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

24.10.2025

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Katpadi.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Katpadi Police Station,
Vellore District.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.28851 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.28851 of 2025

24.10.2025