



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6253 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 6253 of 2026

Manikandan Alias Pulimootai Manikandan
S/o.Selvaraj,
No.5, Allikulam Park Town,
Chennai - 600 003.
Presently confined in
Central Prison II,
Puzhal Chennai - 600 066.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
G2 Periyamedu Police Station,
Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS, 2023, praying to set aside the order dated 20.06.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.6951/2025 on the file of Honble II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s):

Shaikh Mehrunnisa Kasim

For Respondent(s):

Mr.P.Dhileepan

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The present petition has been filed aggrieved by the order of the learned II Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai dated 20.06.2025, by which the learned Magistrate cancelled the bail granted to the petitioner.



2. While looking at the impugned order, it is seen that the petitioner was charged under sections 126(2), 296(b), 118(1), 309(4), 311, 351(3) of BNS and section 25(1-A) of Arms Act and was granted bail by the learned Principal Sessions Judge on 06.03.2025 with certain conditions, wherein a specific direction was given to the Trial Court to take action in the event of breach of any of the bail conditions as per the Judgement of the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji Vs.State of Kerala reported in (2005) AIR SCW 5560.

3. In the case on hand, the petitioner has not complied with the conditions and thereby the learned Magistrate cancelled the bail vide the impugned order dated 20.06.2025.

4. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that at that relevant point of time he was detained under Goondas Act, and therefore the question of non-compliance with the conditions does not arise. The said submission, though attractive, could not be accepted.

5. A perusal of the conditions imposed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge would reveal that the petitioner was directed to sign before the concerned Court. If really the petitioner had been in custody at the relevant point of time, qua on the date of passing the order, he could have informed the same to the



learned Principal Judge, whereas no such information was placed before this Court. Hence, this Court does not find any infirmity in the impugned order.

WEB COPY

6. With the above observations, this petition is dismissed.

11-03-2026

MPA

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
G2 Periyamedu Police Station,
Chennai.

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



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6253 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

MPA

CRL OP No. 6253 of 2026

11-03-2026