



CRL OP(MD). No.10570 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
WEB COPY

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 29/07/2025

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. VADAMALAI

CRL OP(MD). No.10570 of 2025

and

CRL MP(MD). No.9388 of 2025

1.Mariappa Pandian @ Mariappan,
S/o.Madasamy

2.Selvakumar,
S/o.Sethuraman

... Petitioners/ A1 & A2

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Manur Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.607 of 2025)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Baskar Mathuram,
Advocate

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

For Intervenor : Mr.Dhilipan Pandian R L,
Advocate



CRL OP(MD). No.10570 of 2025

WEB COPY PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.607 of 2025 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A1 & A2, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 308(4) and 351 (3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.607 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that in respect of the 2nd petitioner, an anticipatory bail application moved before this Court by some other counsel was allowed on 26.06.2025 in CrI.O.P.(MD)No.10629 of 2025. Hence, he seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the present petition in respect of the 2nd petitioner alone and has made an endorsement in the bundle to that effect. In view of the endorsement made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as withdrawn as against the 2nd petitioner.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant, an Advocate by



CRL OP(MD). No.10570 of 2025

WEB COPY

profession, has been providing legal opinions on land matters to the 1st accused since 2022. On 11.06.2025, the 1st accused called the de-facto complainant to seek a legal opinion regarding a land. Subsequently, on 13.06.2025, at around 2.00 p.m., the 1st accused and the de-facto complainant, along with his relative, namely Parvesh, met at the residence of the 1st accused. In the meantime, the 2nd accused was introduced to the de-facto complainant. At that time, a quarrel arose between them, during which the 1st accused, along with the other accused, abused the de-facto complainant using filthy language, assaulted him, and snatched a sum of Rs.5,000 from him. Hence, the present case was registered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 1st petitioners is an innocent person and is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence as stated by the prosecution. He, however, submitted that the 1st petitioner is willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the 1st petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that the accused had extorted money from the de-facto complainant, abused him using filthy language, and threatened him with dire consequences. He further submitted that there are



CRL OP(MD). No.10570 of 2025

WEB COPY
totally 24 previous cases registered against the 1st petitioner and has filed an additional typed set of papers to that effect. As the extorted amount has not yet been recovered, he contended that custodial interrogation of the 1st petitioner is necessary in this case. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that there are totally two accused persons in this case and the 1st petitioner has been arrayed as A1. A2 has been granted anticipatory bail by this Court on 26.06.2025 in CrI.O.P.(MD) No.10629 of 2025. There are eleven previous cases registered against the 1st petitioner. He submitted that the extorted amount has not yet been recovered. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the gravity of the offence allegedly committed by the 1st petitioner, and taking note of the fact that the properties have not yet been recovered, and on perusal of the records, which reveal that 24 previous cases are registered against the 1st petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No.10570 of 2025

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as against the 1st petitioner and dismissed as withdrawn as against the 2nd petitioner. Consequently, the connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

sd/-
29/07/2025

/ TRUE COPY /

/08/2025
Sub-Assistant Registrar
(C.S. I / II / III / IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

MKN

TO

1 The Inspector of Police,
Manur Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.

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

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10570 of 2025
Date :29/07/2025

NM/26.08.2025/ 5P/3C

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