



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 3960 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL MP No. 3960 of 2025

in

CrI.O.P.No.28276 of 2023

R.Santhi

W/o.Raja, D.No.B-41, Thally Hudco, Hosur Town,
Krishnagiri District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Rajasekaran
S/o.Porrappa Gounder, No.A68/1, Sipcot
Housing Colony, Dharga, Hosur, Krishnagiri
District.
2. Anbhazhagan
S/o.R.Kannan, No.57/80, Sivan Koil, Indira
Nagar, Marakannam Road, Tindivanam.
3. Sundaram
S/o.Kandasamy, Therpaddai Veethi,
Karimangalam, Dharmapuri District.
4. Inspector Of Police
Bagalur Police Station, Krishnagiri
District.Cr.No.220/2023.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483(3) of BNSS, 2023, to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the respondent 1 to 3 in CrI.OP.No.28276 of 2023 passed by this Honble court on 08.03.2024.

For Petitioner(s): M/s.R.Krishnan

For Respondent(s): Mr.P.Dhileepan
Government Advocate (CrI.Side) For R4
M/s. R.Marudhachalamurthy for R1 to R3



ORDER

WEB COPY

The present application has been filed seeking to cancel the bail granted by this Court vide order dated 08.03.2024 in Crl.O.P.No.28276 of 2023.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there is a condition in para 9(d), wherein the petitioners were restrained from interfering with the smooth functioning of the school and not to threaten any of the witnesses. However, in the present case, one Mr.Sundaram allegedly entered the school premises and removed the CCTV cameras. In connection with the said incident, an FIR has been registered on 19.03.2024 in Crime No.6 of 2024. Thereafter, it is also alleged that the said Sundaram instructed one Radhiga of the school to provide the password in respect of the income tax accounts, and in this regard a CSR has been registered. It is the specific submissions of the learned counsel for the petitioner that since Sundaram interfered with the smooth functioning of the school in contravention to the bail conditions, the bail granted to the petitioners is to be cancelled.

3. Percontra the learned counsel for the intervener would submit that though the bail petition was filed by 3 persons, namely Rajasekaran, Anbhazhagan and Sundaram, ultimately bail was granted only to two persons, namely petitioners 1 and 2/Rajasekaran and Anbhazhagan, whereas the bail petition in respect of Sundaram was dismissed. Therefore only if Rajasekaran and Anbhazhagan have violated the bail conditions, this petition is be maintainable. However, based on the alleged action of



Sundaram, the bail granted to Rajasekaran and Anbhazhagan cannot be cancelled.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate would also contend that the FIR was registered in connection with the alleged acts of Sundaram and that a CSR has also been issued in this regard.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made on either side.

6. As rightly submitted by the learned counsel for the respondent, bail was granted only to Rajasekaran and Anbhazhagan. However, the allegations now raised by the petitioner, more specifically the alleged violation of the direction of this Court, relates to one Sundaram and there are no specific allegations against Rajendiran and Anbhazhagan. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there are no materials to arrive at the conclusion that Rajasekaran and Anbhazhagan have violated the bail conditions. Hence, no grounds have been made out for cancellation of bail. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

11-03-2026

MPA



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 3960 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

MPA

To

1. Inspector Of Police
Bagalur Police Station, Krishnagiri
District.Cr.No.220/2023.
2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai.

CRL MP No. 3960 of 2025
in
CrI.O.P.No.28276 of 2023

11-03-2026