



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.3055 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.3055 of 2026

Thangeswaran @ Eswarapandian

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep by
Inspector of Police,
Valathy Police Station,
Villupuram District.
Crime No.218 of 2025

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.218 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Vetrivel

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 329(4), 296(b), 140(2) and 308(4) of BNS, in Crime No.218 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The prosecution is that the petitioner herein had joined hands with other accused trespassed into the defacto complainant's house, robbed a sum of Rs.4,00,000/- and other properties and they were involved in abducting the defacto complainant and demanded ransom. Further, on the way, they have attacked the defacto complainant with knife and transported him to various places. On the way, the police on suspicion, chased them and hence they have dropped the victim and other belongings and escaped from there, which led to the registration of the FIR. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Though it is stated that the defacto complainant was abducted at 07.40a.m., there was no complaint lodged by the family members for 04.00 hours till the defacto complainant was rescued by the police. He further submitted that some of the co-accused were enlarged on bail and anticipatory by this Court vide order dated 01.12.2025, 18.12.2025, 30.12.2025 in Crl.OP.Nos.32862 of 2025 and 3055 and 36072 of 2025 respectively and the petitioner is not having any previous case and he is ready to cooperate with the investigation and hence, prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the



statement of the arrested accused revealed that all the petitioners came to the place of occurrence and they were awaiting outside the house and after abducting the the defacto complainant, they have also made regular contacts with A1. She further produced the call details showing that on particular date 132 calls were made by the first petitioner with A1 and 141 calls made by the second petitioner with A1 in this case. She further submitted that investigation in this case is pending. and hence, opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. .Considering the facts that the petitioners have actively participated in the abduction and also the call details produced before me also shows that they have coordinated with the main accused, the statement of the arrested accused revealed that the petitioner has also participated in the conspiracy to commit abduction for ransom, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

09.02.2026

Vv



To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Valathy Police Station,
Villupuram District.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



Crl.OP.No.3055 of 20__



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.3055 of 2026

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.3055 of 2026

09.02.2026