



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 8338 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 8338 of 2026

Veerapandian

..Petitioner

Vs

The State Rep By,
The Inspector of Police
K-8 Arumbakkam Police Station,
Chennai - 600106.

..Respondent

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under section 482 of BNSS to enlarge the petitioner on bail the event of his arrest pending investigation in Crime No.104 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner:

Ms.Hashika A

For Respondent:

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

For De facto
Complainant:

Mr.A.P.Magesh

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 189(2), 191(2), 296(b), 308(2), 115(2) and 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS) 2023 in Crime No.104 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitions along with other persons threatened the de facto complainant to extort money. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was an agreement between the de facto complainant and this petitioner to sell the property belongs to the de facto complainant and in this connection, the de facto complainant agreed to pay Rs.30,00,000/- as commission in furtherance of their oral agreement. The petitioner arranged purchaser and the property has been sold. However, the de facto complainant did not comply with the promise and when the petitioner demanded his commission, the de facto complainant has given false complaint. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. At this juncture, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the petitioner is a rowdy and has five previous cases and demands *maamool*. Further, it is the submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), that the petitioner used to demand money if any property is sold in that locality. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



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

WEB COPY

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and having considered the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) and from the fact that the petitioner has five previous cases and the conduct of intimidating the de facto complainant for sake of commission, this Court is of the view that he is not entitled to get anticipatory bail as he misused the liberty granted by this Court through bail in previous cases. Hence, this Court is of a firm view that the petitioner is not deserved to be enlarged on anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

02-04-2026

SHL

To:

1. The Inspector of Police
K-8 Arumbakkam Police Station,
Chennai – 600106.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 8338 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN J.

SHL

CRL OP No. 8338 of 2026

02-04-2026