



Crl.OP.No.29863 and 29856 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 03.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.29863 and 29856 of 2025

Shanthi
2025)

... Petitioner
(in Crl.OP.No.29863 of

Murugan
2025)

... Petitioner
(in Crl.OP.No.29856 of

Vs.

The State Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Gudiyatham Taluk Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Cr.No.248 of 2025)

... Respondent
(in both Crl.OPS)

COMMON PRAYER : Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in Cr.No.248 of 2025 on the file of the respondent.

Crl.OP.Nos.29863 and 29856 of 2025

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Deepak Kumar



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.29863 and 29856 of 2025

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

COMMON ORDER

The petitioner in Crl.OP.NO.29863 of 2025, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 05.10.2025 for the alleged offence under Section 194 BNSS @ 105, 238 of BNS in Crime No.248 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The petitioner in Crl.OP.NO.29856 of 2025, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 09.10.2025 for the alleged offence under Section 194 BNSS @ 105, 238 @ 105, 238 of BNS and 135(1)(a)IE Act r/w 25(1)(a) of Arms Act in Crime No.248 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners in Crl.O.P.Nos.29863 and 29856 of 2025 are ranked as A1 and A2 respectively. A1 had installed an electric fence around his agricultural land with the help of A2 by illegally drawing electricity. The deceased, who was a neighbour, unknowingly came into contact with the electrified fence while going to the agricultural land and was electrocuted. Immediately thereafter, the petitioners



along with the other accused took the body and dumped it in a nearby place, thereby committing the offence of screening the evidence of the crime.

Hence, the case.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that A1 had installed the electric fence only to protect his crops and that the incident was purely accidental. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are totally four accused involved in this case. A1 is the landowner; A2 assisted him in fixing the electric fence; and A3 and A4 helped them in dumping the body of the deceased and in screening the occurrence. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioners.

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



WEB COPY

7. Considering the fact that the petitioners not only caused the death of the deceased but also participated in screening the offence by dumping the body nearby and covering it with plastic bags, I am not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, these Criminal Original Petitions stand dismissed.

03.11.2025

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Gudiyatham.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Gudiyatham Taluk Police Station,
Vellore District..
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.29863 and 29856 of 2025

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.29863 and 29856 of 2025

03.11.2025