



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.9125 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.04.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN**

Crl.O.P.No.9125 of 2026

Sundharamoorthy, S/o.Pavadai

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep. By its  
The Inspector of Police,  
Arakandanallur Police Station,  
Villupuram District.  
Crime No.81/2026

... Respondent

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Cr.No.81 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Ms.R.Raji

For Respondent : Mr.P.Dhileepan,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

**ORDER**

The petitioner herein apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(3), 109 of BNS, 2023 read with Section 4 of TNPHW Act, 2002, in Crime No.81 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the de-facto complainant and attacked with each other and abused filthy language and threatened with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. It was further submitted that the entire issue is in respect of partition of land. It was further submitted that the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation and abide by any other stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that four persons injured in the incident. He stated that the petitioner as well as the first accused indiscriminately assaulted the de-facto complainant, who was subsequently hospitalized for more than 20 days. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.9125 c



5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the grave nature of the injuries sustained by the de-facto complainant and the fact that they underwent treatment for more than 20 days, this Court is of the view that the petitioner is not entitled to anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original petition is dismissed.

**10.04.2026**

mp

To

1. The Inspector of Police, Arakandanallur Police Station, Villupuram District.
2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.9125 of 2026

**C.KUMARAPPAN, J.**

mp

**Crl.OP.No.9125 of 2026**

**10.04.2026**