



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19.11.2025

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.31538 of 2025

Manivannan

... Petitioner

-Vs-

State Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Kurisilapattu Police Station,
Tirupathur District.
(Crime No.116 of 2025)

... Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS Act, 2023,
pleased to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.116 of 2025 pending on the
file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Ms.S.Nadhiya

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

ORDER



WEB COPY

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 11.09.2025, for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 88, 66 of BNS, 2023 and Section 5(2) of Medical Termination of Pregnancy Act, 1971 and Sections 6(a), 6(b) and 20 of the Pre-Conception and Pre-Natal Diagnostic Techniques (Prohibition of Sex Selection) Act, 1994 in Crime No.116 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with other accused conducted a 'Prenatal Diagnostic Test' and found that the foetus in the womb was female. It is further alleged that the petitioner and others aborted the foetus by administering certain medicines after collecting a huge amount. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is ranked as A1. He further submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated, since he has got some previous cases. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the



respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are

totally 5 accused in this case and the petitioner is ranked as A1. He further

submitted that though other accused granted bail, this petitioner is having three

previous cases, including 2 cases, similar in nature. Hence, he opposed to grant

anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record including the First Information Report.

6. Considering the nature of the allegations and the fact that the petitioner has three previous cases, two of which are of a similar nature, and though the other co-accused have been granted bail, the petitioner appears to be habitually involved in similar offences, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

19.11.2025

drl



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.31538 o



To

1 The Inspector of Police,
Kurisilapattu Police Station,
Tirupathur District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

K. RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.31538 of 2025



Crl.O.P.No.31538 of 2025

19.11.2025