



CRL OP(MD).No.9217 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 19.06.2025

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. VADAMALAI

CRL OP(MD).No.9217 of 2025

Nicholas

... Petitioner / Sole Accused

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Mathur Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
(Crime No.85 of 2025)

... Respondent / Complainant

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS) for Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.85 of 2025
on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Banumathy,
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.S.Prakash,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for

<https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis>



CRL OP(MD).No.9217 of 2025

WEB COPY

the offences punishable under Sections 79, 296(b), and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, and Section 4 of the TNPWH Act, in Crime No.85 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is working as an Office Assistant at St.Thomas Higher Secondary School, Pudukkottai. The petitioner/accused is the Headmaster of the said school. In the year 2018, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioner/accused alleging that he dishonoured her. Pursuant to the said complaint, departmental action was initiated against the petitioner/accused, and he was transferred to another school. Subsequently, the petitioner/accused was re-appointed as Headmaster at the same school. Following his reappointment, it is alleged that the petitioner once again subjected the defacto complainant to disgrace and issued threats of dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that a false case has been foisted against the petitioner. He would further submit that there are no previous cases against the petitioner. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that the



CRL OP(MD).No.9217 of 2025

WEB COPY

accused person continuously harassed the defacto complainant and threatened her with dire consequences. He would also submit that there are no previous cases against the petitioner. He would also submit that the investigation is still pending, and therefore, he strongly opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court has heard the learned counsel on both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the nature of the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner and also taking into consideration the objections raised by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) and taking note the stage of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.

7. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-

19/06/2025

/ TRUE COPY /

/06/2025

Sub-Assistant Registrar
(C.S. I / II / III / IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

PAL

TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
KEERANUR,PUDUKKOTTAI.



CRL OP(MD).No.9217 of 2025

2 THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
MATHUR POLICE STATION,
PUDUKKOTTAI DISTRICT.

4 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.9217 of 2025
Date :19/06/2025

NM/04.07.2025/ 4P/5C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing certified copies in this format from 17/07/2023