



CRL OP(MD).No.9951 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
WEB COPY

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 23.06.2025

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. VADAMALAI

CRL OP(MD).No.9951 of 2025

and

CRL MP(MD).No.7896 of 2025

M.Marimuthu

... Petitioner / Accused No.1

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Karimedu Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No.309 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.309 of
2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Subash Babu,
Senior Advocate
for Mr.C.Susikumar,
Advocate

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



CRL OP(MD).No.9951 of 2025

For Intervener : Mr.C.Mayil Vahana Rajendran,
Advocate
WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 115(2), 132, 133 and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No.309 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is employed as a driver with the Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation at the Tirupur Branch. On 08.06.2025, at about 8:30 p.m., he was deputed to drive a bus bearing Registration No.TN-38-N-0297 from Tirupur to Arappalayam, Madurai, as a special trip. Since there was a large number of passengers waiting at the Arappalayam Bus Stand, he dropped the passengers outside the bus stand. At that time, the petitioner, who is working as an Assistant Manager with the Tamil Nadu State Transport Corporation, allegedly snatched the invoice from the conductor and argued with him, and directed him to come to the office to collect it. When the defacto complainant went to the office to collect the invoice, the petitioner is said to have abused him using filthy language and also assaulted him with a slipper. The said incident was



CRL OP(MD).No.9951 of 2025

WEB COPY
reportedly recorded on a mobile phone by one of the public and circulated on social media. Subsequently, due to bodily pain, the defacto complainant was admitted to Dharapuram Government Hospital. Based on the above allegations, an FIR came to be registered. 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 there are totally five accused persons in this case and the petitioner has been arrayed as A1. He would further submit that the injured person is still undergoing treatment as an in-patient at the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore. 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 opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD).No.9951 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant would submit that the failure of the petitioner to fulfill his official duties is believed to be driven by his vested interest in promoting private transport services. This not only undermines the integrity of the public transport system but also compromises the safety and convenience of passengers. In light of these allegations, custodial interrogation of the Petitioner is vital to uncover the extent of his involvement in the alleged corrupt practices. Specifically, it is necessary to investigate the financial transactions between the petitioner and private transport operators, as well as the role of other individuals who may be involved in such corrupt activities. He would further submit that the defacto complainant is still undergoing treatment as an in-patient at the Government Medical College Hospital, Coimbatore. Therefore, he opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. This Court has heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature of the offence allegedly committed by the petitioner, and the fact that the injured is still undergoing treatment as an in-patient at the Government Medical College



CRL OP(MD).No.9951 of 2025

Hospital, Coimbatore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the
WEB COPY
petitioner at this stage.

8. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

sd/-
23/06/2025

/ TRUE COPY /

/07/2025
Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S. I / II / III / IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

pal
TO

1.The Inspector of Police,
Karimedu Police Station,
Madurai City.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.9951 of 2025
and CRL MP(MD).No.7896 of 2025
Date :23/06/2025

HPS/02.07.2025 /5P/3C

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