



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.9677 of 2026

Krishnakumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State: Inspector of Police
S 10 Pallikaranai Police Station
Chennai.
Cr.No.123 of 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 the above Cr.No.123 of 2026 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Rajavelu

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

For Intervener : Mr.K.Hemanathan

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 296(B), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS Section 4 of TNPWH Act in Crime No.123 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant. Due to matrimonial dispute the petitioner



attacked the defacto complainant with hands and caused injury. Hence, the complaint has been registered.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the occurrence took place on 05.04.2026 and, in furtherance thereof, the de facto complainant sustained injuries and was hospitalized for a period of six days. He would further submit that the petitioner was also assaulted by the de facto complainant with the assistance of her father, who is stated to be a politically influential person, and that the petitioner sustained injuries on his face and fingers, for which he had taken treatment at Kilpauk Hospital. He would further submit that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and is willing to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the intervener would submit the photographs before this Court, which disclose that the de facto complainant sustained serious injuries on her neck, face and nose. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the case of the prosecution and submitted that the



de facto complainant was hospitalized for six days and that she had sustained a fracture to her nose due to the act of the petitioner. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Considering the serious nature of the allegations and the injuries sustained by the de facto complainant, this Court is of the firm view that, if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, it would have an adverse impact on the societal conscience. Therefore, this Court finds that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

27.04.2026

1/2

kv

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate Court No.II, Alandur.

2. The Inspector of Police
S 10 Pallikaranai Police Station
Chennai.

3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

3/4



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.9677 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN.J.

kv

Crl.O.P.No.9677 of 2026

27.04.2026
1/2