



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6960 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 6960 of 2026

Praveenkumar (A7)

..Petitioner

Vs

The State Rep. by its,
The Inspector of Police,
M-3, Puzhal Police Station,
Chennai. (Cr.No.105 of 2026)

..Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the above Cr.No.105 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent.

For Petitioner:

Mr.S.Senthilvel

For Respondent:

Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 02.02.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 310(2), 311 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, @ 310(2), 311 r/w 61(2) of B.N.S. in Crime No.105 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 30.01.2026, the petitioner along with other accused persons trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, tied him with a rope and robbed a sum of Rs.25,00,000/-, 15 sovereigns of gold



jewels and 250 grams of silver at knife point and fled from the scene. Hence, the case was registered.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged. It is submitted that the FIR was originally registered against A1 to A6 and the petitioner was subsequently arrayed as A7 without any material. It is the specific contention of the learned counsel that the petitioner, being an Advocate, had rendered legal assistance to A1 to A6 and owing to such professional engagement, the respondent police, out of vengeance, have arrayed him as A7 based solely on the confession statement of A4. Hence, he prays for grant of bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the earlier bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 03.03.2026 in Crl.O.P.No.5424 of 2026 and there is absolutely no change in circumstances for reconsideration. It is further submitted that the offence is grave in nature involving house trespass and robbery of huge amount of Rs.25 lakhs along with gold ornaments. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.



5. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side.

WEB COPY

6. This Court is of the view that from the submission of the learned counsel on either side, it is seen that the earlier bail application filed by the petitioner was dismissed on 03.03.2026 in CrI.O.P.No.5424 of 2026 and that there is no change in circumstance. It is further seen that the allegation against the petitioner is of serious nature involving house trespass and robbery of huge amount of Rs.25 lakhs along with gold ornaments. In such circumstances, this Court is of the view that there is no change in circumstances warranting grant of bail. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

18-03-2026

NSL

To

1. The Inspector of Police, M-3 Puzhal Police Station, Chennai.
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6960 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

NSL

CRL OP No. 6960 of 2026

18-03-2026