



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.30564 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.30564 of 2025

1.Senkodan @ Sengodan
2.Srirangan @ Elangovan @ Sreerangan ... Petitioners
Vs.

The State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Deevattipatti Police Station,
Salem District. ... Respondent
(Crime No.473 of 2025)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with the Crime No.473 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Muruganandham
For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For Intervener : Mr.T.Ganesan

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 189(2), 329, 351(3) of BNS and Section 3(1) of the Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of



Damage and Loss) Act, 1992 in Crime No. 473 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Earlier, this Court dismissed the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioners in Crl.OP.No.26358 of 2025 by order dated 06.10.2025, for the first and second petitioners, on the following reasons:

“7. Print out copies of CCTV footages have been produced to show the presence of the accused herein at the time of occurrence and also damages caused by them. Though it is stated that the dispute arose based on the land dispute, this Court is of the view that the way in which the petitioners, more particularly A1 and A2 tried to resolve their dispute by adopting various activities and attacked the defacto complainant and his family members during night time and also damaged various properties. Granting anticipatory bail to them will further encourage them to involve in the very same offence. However considering the fact that the petitioners 3 & 4 are ladies, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 3 and 4 alone. As far as the petitioners 1 and 2 are concerned, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 1 and 2. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed in so far as the petitioners 1 and 2 are concerned.”



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.30564 of 2025

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are ready to deposit some amount as compensation for the loss to the defacto complainant. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. However, this Court is not inclined to consider the same, since the reason stated in the earlier order is subsisting and there is no change in circumstances to revisit the earlier order.

5. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

10.11.2025

drl

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Deevattipatti Police Station,
Salem District.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.30564 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.
drl

Crl.O.P.No.30564 of 2025

10.11.2025