



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE M. NIRMAL KUMAR

CRL OP No. 6769 of 2026

and

CrL.MP.No.4939 of 2026

1. S.Preethi
D/o.D.Sekar,
2. S.Arthi Surantha @ Sreeleela
D/o.D.Sekar,

Both are residing at
No.139, Kannapiran Koil Street,
Paruthiputhur Village and Post,
Arakkonam taluk, Ranipet District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State of Tamilnadu rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
Arakkonam Taluk Police Station,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.
2. P.Moorthy
S/o.Poongavanam,
No.141, Kannapiran Koil Street,
Paruthiputhur Village and Post,
Arakkonam Taluk,Ranipet District.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: The criminal original petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS to quash the FIR No.397 of 2025 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Arakkonam Taluk Police station, Arakkonam, pending disposal of CrL.OP. and pass such further or other orders as this Honble court.



WEB COPY



For Petitioner(s):

Mr.R.Harinath

For Respondent(s):

Mr. LEONARD ARUL JOSEPH SELVAM
ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
for R1

Mr.K.Madhan
for R2

ORDER

The petitioners, who are A7 & A5 in crime No.397 of 2025 for offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2) & 109(1) BNS, 2023, filed this quash petition.

2.The contention of the petitioners is that they have been falsely implicated in this case. On the date of occurrence, the petitioners were attending an examination and they have produced the Hall Ticket and college identity card to show that they were not present in the scene of occurrence. He further submitted that the petitioners are teachers and they have been falsely implicated in this case. It is only a neighbourhood dispute, which has been unnecessarily magnified and projected as though the petitioners had joined the other accused and assaulted and abused the defacto complainant and others. He further submitted that in fact, the defacto complainant was involved and arrested in another crime No.6 of 2025 by the respondent police and that occurrence is prior to this occurrence. Hence, this complaint has been lodged only as a counterblast against the petitioners.



3.The learned counsel for the defacto complainant/second respondent strongly opposed the contentions of the petitioners and produced photographs showing that the victim had sustained injuries on his head and he was taking treatment as an inpatient and 24 sutures were administered to him.

4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the petitioners are making rival contentions and that same can be decided during investigation, and investigation is in progress. He further submitted that medical records of the defacto complainant have been collected. If the petitioners produce any tangible materials, the same would be considered and appropriate steps would be taken by filing the final report in this case.

5.Recording the same, the criminal original petition is disposed of.

15-04-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No
sms



To

1. The State of Tamilnadu rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
Arakkonam Taluk Police Station,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.

2. The Public prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6769 of 2



M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

sms

CRL OP No. 6769 of 2026

15-04-2026