



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO.32387 of 2025

Mint Ramesh @ M.Ramesh

Petitioner

Vs

The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai – 600 066.
Crime No.761 of 2025.

Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.761 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner:

Mr.R.C.Paul Kanagaraj

For Respondent:

Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody



on 04.09.2025 for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 140(2) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.761 of 2025, seeks bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner had forcibly demanded the defacto complainant to execute a sale deed in his favour. When the defacto complainant refused to accede to such demand, the petitioner joined hands with other accused allegedly abducted the defacto complainant in an auto and attempted to obtain his signature in the documents. However, they later dropped him and left the place. It is further alleged that the defacto complainant lodged the complaint only after five months. Based on the said complaint, the petitioner was arrested.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that thought the petitioner is having bad antecedents, for the purpose of detaining him under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982, he was falsely implicated in another case in Crime No.436 of 2025 on the file of Redhills Police Station, pursuant to which he was detained. He further submitted that when the petitioner challenged the detention order by filing an HCP and the matter was likely to be quashed, during its



pendency, the present case was registered on 04.09.2025 for an occurrence alleged to have taken place on 12.04.2025. Hence, he prayed to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are totally four accused and the petitioner is ranked as A1 in this case; and that the petitioner is involved in ten previous cases. According to the prosecution, the petitioner abducted the defacto complainant and demanded that he transfer the ownership of the land in his favour, and thereafter dropped him on the way. He further contended that if the petitioner is released on bail, he is likely to indulge in similar activities. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the fact that the alleged occurrence took place in the month of April 2025, the complaint came to be registered only in the month of September 2025 and the fact that the petitioner had attempted to obtain the signature of the defacto complainant after abducted him and thereafter



WEB COPY

immediately set him free, though the petitioner is having previous cases, he was already detained under the Tamil Nadu Act 14 of 1982 and the said detention order was set aside by this Court and also considering the period of his incarceration, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner on certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on her executing a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** with two sureties, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the *learned Judicial Magistrate, Madhavaram*, and on further conditions that:-

[a] 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 stay at Erode and report before the Erode Town Police Station daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

[c] the petitioner shall not abscond either during



investigation or trial;

[d] the petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or witness 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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 B.N.S.

05.12.2025

drl



Note:

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.
2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Madhavaram.
2. The Inspector of Police,
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai – 600 066.
3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison, Cuddalore.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.,

drl

CRL OP NO.32387 of 2025

05.12.2025