



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 4608 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-03-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 4608 of 2026

AND

CRL MP NO. 3604 OF 2026

1. K.Rajkumar

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police
Vellakoil Police Station, Tiruppur District.
Crime No. 467/2025.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail concerned in Crime No.467 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Shanmuga Velayutham, Senior Counsel
for Mr.S.Senthil

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor(s): Mr.N.Manoharan

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 27.10.2025 for the alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 109(2), 103(1) and 324(4) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No.467 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that, due to previous enmity, while the deceased and the defacto complainant were travelling on a two-wheeler on the main road, the petitioner drove his car in a rash and negligent manner and hit them, causing the death of the deceased on the spot. It is further alleged that the petitioner also attacked them with an iron rod and abused them in filthy language. Hence, the case.

3. The learned Senior Counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner and the son of the defacto complainant were partners in a real estate business and, due to disputes relating to sharing of property, an altercation arose, during which the occurrence is alleged to have taken place. It is the further submission of the learned Senior Counsel that the petitioner has been in incarceration for the past 125 days and that the charge sheet has already been filed. Hence, it is contended that this is a fit case to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

4. The said contention was strongly opposed by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent, who submitted that there are about ten previous cases pending against the petitioner under the Prohibition Act and that, if the petitioner is enlarged on bail, it would adversely affect society at large. Therefore, he prayed for dismissal of the bail petition.



5. The said contention raised by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) was reiterated by the learned counsel appearing for the intervenor.

6. No doubt, the petitioner has been in incarceration for more than 125 days and the charge sheet has been filed and taken on file in S.C.No.57 of 2026. However, the fact remains that, according to the petitioner, there are seven previous cases against him, whereas according to the prosecution, there are about ten previous cases pending against him under the Prohibition Act. Considering the criminal antecedents attributed to the petitioner and the larger interest of society, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

02-03-2026

skr

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 4608 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN J.
skr

To

1. The learned Judicial Magistrate, Kangeyam.
2. The Inspector of Police, Vellakoil Police Station, Tiruppur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Chennai.

**CRL OP No. 4608 of 2026
AND CRL MP NO. 3604 OF 2026**

02-03-2026