



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.34514 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.34514 of 2025

Sampath @ Sampathkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Thanipadi Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.
(Crime No.258 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 Crime No.258 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police station.

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Sathiyaraj Elangovan

For Intervenor : Mr.K.Kesavan

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

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS (corresponding sections



294(b), 323, 324 and 506(2) of IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act in Cr.No.258 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that due to irrigation dispute, the petitioner had picked quarrel with the defacto complainant and her husband and also attacked the defacto complainant by using iron rod and caused fracture in her leg, which led to the registration of the FIR. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not having any bad antecedents and the offence was taken place due to the quarrel and hence prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervener submitted that the defacto complainant herein is a lady, she had sustained fracture in her leg and she is still undergoing treatment. He further submitted that the petitioner had also filed another anticipatory bail petition in Crl.MP.No.3574 of 2025 seeking the same relief and the same is pending before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Thiruvannamalai. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant 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

2/4



injured is still undergoing treatment. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the fact the injured is still undergoing treatment and the petitioner had also filed another anticipatory bail petition before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Thiruvannamalai in Crl.MP.No.3574 of 2025 seeking the same relief, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

17.12.2025

Vv

To

1. The District Munsif-Cum-Judicial Magistrate,
Thandrampattu, Thiruvannamalai District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Thanipadi Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.34514 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.34514 of 2025

17.12.2025



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.34514 of 20__