



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 4378 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 23-02-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

**CRL OP No. 4378 of 2026**

Shanmugasundaram  
Son of Angamuthu,  
9/6, Thiyagi Natesan Street,  
No.3, Ammapet,  
Salem-636003.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State rep. by  
The inspector of Police,  
Ammapet Police Station, Salem City,  
Salem District.  
Crime No.43 of 2026

..Respondent(s)

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail, in the event of his arrest, in Crime No.43 of 2026 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Ammapet Police Station, Salem City, Salem District.

For Petitioner(s): Vasudevan Bramalingam

For Respondent(s): M/S.J.R.Archana  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

### **ORDER**

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 329(3), 303(2), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.43 of 2026, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner is the land owner and his property was auctioned for the defaulting loan amount by the bank and the same was purchased by the de facto complainant herein; enraged over the same, this petitioner went to the house of the defacto complainant and threatened him and damaged the wind shield and other property to the extent of Rs.20,000/- and also took away a two-wheeler belonging to the defacto complainant. Hence, the complaint was lodged and the case was registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that already the petitioner herein had challenged the sale proceedings before the Debt Recovery Tribunal, Coimbatore, and the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervener submitted that the two-wheeler of the defacto complainant was taken away by the petitioner and is yet to be recovered. Apart from that, property to the extent of Rs.20,000/- has been damaged by the petitioner, and if the petitioner is released on bail, there is a likelihood that he will indulge in similar offences. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the



respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that so far, the two-wheeler is not recovered, and the petitioner is having one previous case under the Women Harassment Act. Hence, she opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the fact that huge value of the property has been damaged, further the two-wheeler belonging to the defacto complainant is also taken away by the petitioner, and it is also stated before this Court that CCTV footage also revealed that the petitioner has taken away the two-wheeler, and since the two-wheeler is not recovered, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

**23-02-2026**

MPA

To

1. State rep. by  
The inspector of Police,  
Ammamet Police Station, Salem City,  
Salem District.  
Crime No.43 of 2026

2.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 4378 of 2



**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

**MPA**

**CRL OP No. 4378 of 2026**

**23-02-2026**