



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33544 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.33544 of 2025

1.A.Vignesh Kumar
2.G.Kishore Ram

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State rep by

Inspector of Police,
Valathy Police Station,
Villupuram District.
Crime No.218 of 2025

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest by the respondent police in Crime No.218 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, the Inspector of Police, Valathy Police Station, Villupuram District.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Mareeswaran

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

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 329(4), 296(b), 140(2) and 308(4) of BNS, in Crime No.218 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution is that the petitioners herein are arrayed as A7 and A13 and they have joined hands with other accused involved in abducting the defacto complainant and demanded ransom. Further, on the way, they have attacked the defacto complainant with knife point and transported him to various places. On the way, the police on suspicion, chased them and hence they have dropped the victim and other belongings and escaped from there, which led to the registration of the FIR. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Though it is stated that the defacto complainant was abducted at 07.40a.m., there was no complaint lodged by the family members for 04.00 hours till the defacto complainant was rescued by the police. He further submitted that the 1st petitioner's vehicle was used for abduction. He further submitted that one of the co-accused was enlarged on bail by this Court vide order dated 01.12.2025 in Crl.OP.No.32862 of 2025 and the petitioners are not having any previous case and they are ready to cooperate with the investigation and hence, prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the statement of the arrested accused revealed that all the petitioners came to the



place of occurrence and they were awaiting outside and after abducting the the defacto complainant, and these petitioners were travelled in another vehicle followed the other vehicle. Thereafter they have also made regular contacts with A1. She further produced the call details showing that on particular date 132 calls were made by the first petitioner with A1 and 141 calls made by the second petitioner with A1 in this case. She further submitted that investigation in this case is pending. and hence, opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. .Considering the facts that the petitioners have actively participated in the abduction and also the call details produced before me also shows that they have coordinated with the main accused and they have followed the other group in another car. Further, the statement of the arrested accused revealed that the petitioners have also participated in the conspiracy to commit abduction for ransom. Though it is stated that the co-accused was released on bail, since he has been forced to driver the car as per the instructions of the other accused, he was granted anticipatory bail and said ground is not available to petitioner hence I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.



CrI.OP.No.33544 of 20__

18.12.2025

Vv

WEB COPY

1.The Inspector of Police,
Valathy Police Station,
Villupuram District.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33544 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.33544 of 2025

18.12.2025