



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 08/09/2025

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

Vishnu Prasad,
S/o.Late. Palanichamy

... Petitioner/A3

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
G-1, Paramakudi Town Police Station,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.
(Crime No.74 of 2025)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Thirumoorthy

For Respondent : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabakar,
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of
BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.74 of 2025 on the file of the
Respondent Police.

1/8



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/A3, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 103(1), 238, 61(2) of BNS in Crime No.74 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. This is the second anticipatory bail application before this Court. The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant, who is a lawyer at the Paramakudi Combined Court, is the nephew of the deceased Uthirakumar Sethupathipandian, who was also practicing as a lawyer at the Madras High Court. The deceased Uthirakumar Sethupathipandian and one Palanichamy were involved in the real estate business, and due to business-related disputes, there was animosity between them. On 05.03.2025, at about 9.00 p.m., the deceased was speaking with the de-facto complainant in an alley opposite to Nagalingam Petrol Station, near Krishna Theatre. After leaving, the de-facto complainant reached about 50 feet near the road to go home, the deceased suddenly screamed. At that moment, the de-facto complainant



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

saw three persons arrived on a motorcycle and murdered Uthirakumar Sethupathipandian on the spot. Thereafter, they fled the scene. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the deceased Uthirakumar was a habitual offender, with ten previous cases registered against him, including three murder cases, offences under the Arms Act, and cases of kidnap and extortion. The deceased had suppressed all these facts and enrolled himself as an Advocate with the Bar Council of Tamil Nadu and Puducherry.

4. He further submitted that the de-facto complainant, along with the deceased, had kidnapped the petitioner's father, namely Palanichamy, at knife point and obtained ten property documents from him as ransom. Consequently, a case was registered in Crime No.44 of 2023, dated 13.03.2023. Subsequently, on 29.03.2024, the petitioner's father was murdered by the deceased at Chennai, and another case was registered in Crime No.80 of 2024 on the file of the Taramani Police Station, Chennai. A charge sheet has been filed in S.C.No.273 of 2024 on the file of the



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

learned XVI Additional Sessions Judge, Chennai, and the case is still pending.

5. He also submitted that, prior to the said incidents, the petitioner's father had initiated money recovery suits against the de-facto complainant in O.S.Nos.26 and 27 of 2024, which are pending on the file of the learned Additional District Judge, Paramakudi. Under such circumstances, when his uncle, the deceased Uthirakumar, was murdered on 05.03.2025, the de-facto complainant, with an ulterior motive, deliberately implicated the petitioner and his family in the present case. The only intention of the de-facto complainant is to falsely implicate the petitioner and his family in order to compel a compromise in all other pending cases.

6. He further submitted that the petitioner is a practicing advocate in Chennai, and has no previous bad antecedents, and is willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that there are totally seven accused persons in this case and the petitioner has been arrayed as A3. A1 is the petitioner's mother, and A2 is the petitioner's sister. He submitted that due to a business-related misunderstanding, the deceased had murdered the petitioner's father, namely Palanichamy. Subsequently, with the support and instigation of the petitioner, A4 to A7 murdered the deceased, and they are currently detained under the Goondas Act. He also submitted that the confession statement of A6 clearly establishes that the murder was committed at the instigation of the petitioner. He further submitted that the investigation is almost completed. However, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, and also the fact that the investigation has been almost completed, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

WEB COPY

9. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Paramakudi within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and on further conditions that:

[a] the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity;

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation and the petitioner shall not leave at Chennai;

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner is 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 absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

(S S Y J)
08.09.2025

msrm

To

- 1.The learned Judicial Magistrate
Paramakudi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
G-1, Paramakudi Town Police Station,
Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

7/8



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.14650 of 2025

S,SRIMATHY,J

msrm

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.14650 of 2025**

08.09.2025