



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 20-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 9804 of 2026

1. Sena @ Senapathy,
S/o.Balasubramaniyan,
Thenpathi,
Aravoor,
Valangaiman Taluk,
Tiruvarur District.
2. Dhinesh
S/o Kundumuthu @ Ammasi Kundumuthu,
Adhi Dravidar Street,
Therukkupattam,
Valangaiman Taluk,
Tiruvarur District.

...Petitioners/Accused
No.1 and 2

Vs

State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
Thiruvarur Taluk Police Station,
Thiruvarur District.
(Crime No.32 of 2024)

..Respondent/
Complainant

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS Act, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in P.R.C.No.18 of 2025 on the file of the Judicial Magistrate, Tiruvarur in Crime No.32 of 2024 on the



file of the Inspector of Police, Tiruvarur Taluk Police Station, Tiruvarur District.

WEB COPY

For Petitioners :

Mr.Palanivel Nadimuthu

For Respondent:

Mr.P.Dhileepan

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners/A1 and A2, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Section 25(1A) of the Arms Act in Crime No.32 of 2024, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that when the *de-facto* complainant was on duty at the Court complex, the petitioners/A1 and A2, along with other accused persons, came in an Innova car bearing registration no. TN-21-BZ-0378 at a high speed, and on enquiry, it was found that the accused persons came to the Court complex with some deadly weapons, which were causing danger to human life. Hence, the case.

3. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the respondent.



4. The learned counsel for the petitioners/A1 and A2 would submit that the petitioners were charged for the offences under Section 25(1A) of the Arms Act; that the petitioners are innocents and they have not committed any such offences as alleged by the *de-facto* complainant; and that they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court, and they are ready to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. At this juncture, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the respondent would submit that though this Court has granted bail in Crl.O.P.No.7477 of 2024 dated 26.03.2024, the petitioners have not at all complied with the condition imposed by this Court, and thereby the bail was subsequently cancelled in Crl.M.P.No.268 of 2024 dated 23.04.2024, and apart from that, the petitioners have also had one previous case. Hence, taking into consideration of the above factual position, this Court is of the firm view that the petitioners do not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

dk

20-04-2026



To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Tiruvarur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Thiruvarur Taluk Police Station,
Thiruvarur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.9804 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

dk

CRL OP No. 9804 of 2026

20-04-2026