



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 7403 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 7403 of 2026

Vengatesan @ Vengatesh

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State by, The Inspector of Police,
Kandili Police Station,
Thirupathur District.
Crime No. 92 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023 to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the
event of his arrest by the respondent police in Crime.No.92 of 2026 on the file
of Inspector of Police, Kandili Police Station, Thirupathur District.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.Sasikumar S

For Respondent(s):

Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections
296(B), 115(2), 190, 351(3), 308(4), 127(2), 61(2) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Section 4
of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003, in
Crime No.92 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that due to a money dispute, the petitioner abused and assaulted the de facto complainant using filthy language along with his associates. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police submits that there is a proposal against few of the accused to invoke Goondas Act and that this petitioner along with his associates have threatened and intimidated the de facto complainant to execute a sale deed in respect of the shop belonging to the de facto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is seen that the petitioner has abused and intimidated the de facto complainant to execute a sale deed, in respect of a shop belonging to the



complainant in favour of the petitioner. Considering the seriousness of the allegations leveled against the petitioner and gravity of the offence, and taking into consideration the date of registration of the First Information Report, it is not desirable to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail and if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, he may be emboldened to indulge in similar offences in future without fear of law.

7. In view of the above, this Court does not find any merit in the present anticipatory bail application. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

24-03-2026

rap

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Kandili Police Station,
Thirupathur District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

3. The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Thirupathur.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 7403 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

RAP

CRL OP No. 7403 of 2026

24-03-2026