



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 34451 of 2025

1. C Dharmaraj

2. S Sridhar

3. A Madalaimuthu

4. S Vijayakumar

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State rep.by, The Inspector of Police,
R.S.Puram Police Station,
Coimbatore-641 002. Cr.No.554/2025.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, pleaded to pass an order enlarging the petitioners on anticipatory bail pending investigation in Cr.No.554 of 2025 dated 26.11.2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): M/s.Harsha Vardhini

For Intervenor Mr.R.Raghul



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 34451 of 2025



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

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) and Section 20 of Tamil Nadu Money Lenders Act, 1957, in Crime No.554 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioner, in collusion with other accused, entered the office of the defacto complainant, attacked him with hands and legs, due to which the complainant sustained severe injuries. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the defacto complainant had borrowed money and the same was not repaid, and hence, the petitioners went to the office to demand the money back due to which there was a quarrel, and in fact, the defacto complainant assaulted the petitioners. The petitioners have no previous cases pending against them and hence, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor, relying on the would certificate, submitted that the defacto complainant suffered grievous injuries, and if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they will indulge in similar kinds of offences. Hence, he opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent police reported that the 2nd petitioner was already arrested. He further submitted that defacto complainant suffered dislocation of the shoulder, and he has been discharged from the hospital after treatment. He further submitted that there is no previous cases pending against the petitioners. Hence, he opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the fact that there is no previous cases pending against the petitioners, the injury alleged is a dislocation of the shoulder, and the injured has been discharged from hospital and considering the other circumstances, this Court is inclined to grant **anticipatory bail** to the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 with certain conditions. As far as the 2nd petitioner is concerned, he has been arrested by the respondent police and accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as far as the 2nd petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 (except petitioner No.2) are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance,



within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the ***learned Judicial Magistrate Court I, Coimbatore*** on condition that the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), each with two sureties, each 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 and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 shall report ***before the respondent police on everyday at 10.30 am., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.***

[b] the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

[c] the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 shall not leave India without the prior permission of the Court.

[d] the petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 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 petitioner Nos.1, 3 & 4 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 abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

WEB COPY

16-12-2025

Gbi



CRL OP No. 34451 of 2025



To

WEB COPY

- 1.State rep.by, The Inspector of Police,
R.S.Puram Police Station,
Coimbatore-641 002. Cr.No.554/2025.
- 2.The Judicial Magistrate Court I,
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 34451 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.
gbi

**CRL OP No. 34451 of
2025**

16-12-2025