



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.31099 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.31099 of 2025

Nithishkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State by

Inspector of Police,

Perambalur Police Station,

Perambalur District.

(Crime No.285 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the event of their arrest or surrender in connection with the case in Cr.No.285 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mrs.Ranjitha Venkatesan

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

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under



Sections 191(2), 296(b), 115(2) 351(3) of BNS 2023 and the same was altered into Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3), 109, 140(3), 310(2) and 3(5) of BNS, 2023 in Cr.No.285 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on an earlier occasion, there was a dispute between the parties with regard to conducting a temple festival and exercising temple worship rights, due to which the petitioner, along with others, had attacked the defacto complainant with a wooden log and caused injuries to him.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not a named accused in the FIR and that the persons who were named in the FIR have already been granted bail. He further submitted that there is no overt act attributed to the petitioner and that he has been purposely implicated in this case; hence, he prays for grant of bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the



Crl.OP.No.31099 of 2025

petitioner has one previous case under the Arms Act. It is also submitted that there is no change of circumstances after the dismissal of the petitioner's earlier anticipatory bail petition, and therefore, the present petition is not maintainable. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the fact that there is no change of circumstances after the dismissal of the petitioner's earlier anticipatory bail petition, and the present petition has been filed without any fresh grounds, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

14.11.2025

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court-I,
Perambalur.

3/4



Crl.OP.No.31099 of 2025



2. The Inspector of Police,
Perambalur Police Station,
Perambalur District.

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

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.31099 of 2025

Crl.O.P.No.31099 of 2025

14.11.2025