



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33783 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.33783 of 2025

S.Prabu

... Petitioner

Vs.

State, rep by the
Inspector of Police
Thiruchengode Town Police Station,
Namakkal City.
(Cr.No.409 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of
arrest in Cr.No.409 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vetrivel
for Mr.V.S.Sivanupandian
For Intervenor : Mr.G.Sabari Vishnu
For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner/accused, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence
under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in
Cr.No.409 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory
bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and the de facto
complainant are facing a criminal case. On 14.11.2025, when the de facto
1/4



complainant attended the Court proceedings in Cr.No.824 of 2020 connected with S.C.No.122 of 2023 to mark his appearance, on his return, the petitioner allegedly informed the de facto complainant to withdraw the case by conveying the message to his sister and sister's husband. Thereafter, a quarrel ensued, during which the petitioner allegedly assaulted the de facto complainant with his hands and an iron rod. The said occurrence was video graphed by A2. The police officials on duty intervened and rescued the de facto complainant, which led to the registration of the FIR. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner and the de facto complainant are known to each other and that the de facto complainant himself is an accused in a criminal case. He further submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Therefore, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the occurrence took place inside the Court premises and that the petitioner had brought weapons into the Court campus and assaulted the de facto complainant, causing severe injuries. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioner has previous criminal cases to his credit. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the manner in which the occurrence took place, particularly the allegation that the petitioner entered the Court premises with weapons and was involved in the incident during Court hours, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

10.12.2025

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Tiruchengode.
2. The Inspector of Police
Thiruchengode Town Police Station,
Namakkal City.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33783 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.33783 of 2025

10.12.2025