



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 32051 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 32051 of 2025

Selvaraj

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep by. The Inspector of Police,
Chidambaram Town, P.S, Cuddalore
District. (Cr.No. 216/2025).

Respondent(s)

PRAYER Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to ENLARGE THE PETITIONER/ACCUSED ON BAIL in the event of his arrest in connection with the Crime No. 216 of 2025 pending investigation on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Gandhi Kumar Kalyanasundram
For Intervenor Mr.M.Gopu

For Respondent(s): Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.216 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 196(b), 315(2) and 79 of BNS Act 2023, against the petitioner, the present petition has been filed by the



petitioner seeking anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioner is that due to financial dispute, petitioners verbally abused the defacto complainant and her son and also threatened with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for petitioner submitted that the entire allegation is false, vindictive, wanton and he is no way connected with the offence. He would submit that he has not at all committed any of offence as alleged by the respondent police and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he will abide by any condition that may be imposed by this court. Hence, the learned counsel prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the petitioner is having bad antecedent and he has continuously threatening the defacto complainant and if he is released on anticipatory bail, he would hamper the investigation and tamper the witnesses. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent police reported that the petitioner is also involved in one another case of 420 IPC and



another case and this is the third case and however it is submitted that no one is injured in this case and it is the case of threat made to the defacto complainant through phone. Hence, he opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the allegation levelled in this case and it is a case of criminal intimidation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.2, Chidambaram**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)** with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at **10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required**



for interrogation.

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the Petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the Petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**;

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

02-12-2025

gbi

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



CRL OP No. 32051 of 2025



To

- 1.State Rep by. The Inspector of Police,
Chidambaram Town, P.S, Cuddalore District. (Cr.No. 216/2025).
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate No.2,
Chidambaram.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 32051 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.
gbi

**CRL OP No. 32051 of
2025**

02-12-2025