



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No3317 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 11.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.3317 of 2026

Ranjith @ Ranjith Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep by
G-4, Cheyyur Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Cr.No.16
of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Krishnamoorthy

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on
04.02.2026, for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 296(b),
115(2), 351(3), 109 of BNS in Cr.No.16 of 2026, on the file of the
respondent police, seeks bail.



WEB COPY

2. The allegations against the petitioner/A1 is that this petitioner joined together with other accused and involved in road roko and also wrongfully restrain the defacto complainant and his crew from taking soil from the land belongs to them, which led to the registration of an FIR. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner herein is ranked as A1 in this case, due to his previous cases and it is not the case of attacking any person and it is only the villagers joining together and involved in road roko. Further, no one sustained injuries in this case and the petitioner herein has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 04.02.2026 and he is ready to co-operate with the investigation and also ready and willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and reported that the petitioner is having bad antecedents of 5 previous cases, including 3 murder



cases. He further submitted that if the petitioner is released on bail, there is likelihood in indulging in similar offences and the investigation in this case is pending. Hence, he opposed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

5. By way of reply, the learned counsel for the petitioner, relied upon the Judgment of Hon'ble Apex Court rendered in Crl.Appeal.Nos.152 and 153 of 2020 (Arising out of Special Leave Petitions (Crl) Nos.9207 and 9209 of 2019 respectively in ***Prabhakar Tewari /Vs/ State of Uttar Pradesh and Another***, wherein, it has been held that the previous antecedents alone could not be relevant consideration for rejecting the bail but other circumstances also taken into consideration, while granting or rejecting bail.

6. I have also gone through the records and other connected materials and also perused the judgment of the Hon'ble Apex Court and admittedly in this case, no one sustained any injuries in this case and the photographs produced before me shows that all the villagers were involved in road roko and protested against the arrival of the defacto complainant, due to property dispute and it is also alleged by the villagers that the defacto complainant is also involved in encroachment of lands.



7. Considering the above facts and other circumstances, the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, though investigation is pending in this case, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for a sum of **Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only)** with **two sureties**, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **District Munsif-Cum-Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur** and on further conditions that:

[a] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the Application for Surety ship [Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

[c] the petitioner shall make himself available for interrogation by a Police Officer as and when required;



[d] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly cause any threat to the de facto complainant and witnesses;

[e] the petitioner to give an undertaking that if required for being identified by witnesses during investigation or for police custody beyond the first fifteen days, he shall comply to the directions as may be given by the Court in this regard;

[f] On breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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)13 SCC 283]**;

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

11.02.2026

Vv



Crl.OP.No3317 of 2020

Note :

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.
2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.

To

1. The **District Munsif-Cum-Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur**
2. The G-4, Cheyyur Police Station,
Chengalpattu District.
3. The Chengalpattu District Prison.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No3317 of 2026

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No3317 of 2026

11.02.2026