



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 13103 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 13103 of 2026

Rajendiran

..Petitioner

Vs

State, rep. by
The Sub Inspector of police,
Moranam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
(Crime.No. 49 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 connection with in Crime No. 49 of 2026 on the file of Respondent Police.

For Petitioner:


Mr.Appaswamee VR

For Respondent:

Mr.N.Palanivel
Govt Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 303(2), 324(3), 132 of BNS (Section 294(b), 379, 427 and 353 of IPC r/w under section 3 of TNPPD Act in Crime No.49 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner cut a tree adjacent to a lake without obtaining permission from the Government and there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the de facto complainant, who is serving as the Village Administrative Officer and also the petitioner has abused the de facto complainant in filthy language. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was not at all present at the scene of occurrence, however he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the defacto complainant and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that he is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The said contention was totally objected by the learned Govt Advocate (Crl.Side) and submitted that the petitioner has got two previous cases similar in nature. He further submitted that such factum was also discussed in earlier order dated 27.04.2026 in Crl.OP.No.10532 of 2026 and there are no change in circumstances. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, taking note of the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides, the submission of the learned Govt Advocate (Crl.Side) is liable to be accepted as this Court could not find any change in circumstances and hence, this Court is of the firm view that the Petitioner does not deserve anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

02-06-2026

SHL

To:

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Gingee

2. The Sub Inspector of police,
Moranam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 13103 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN J.

SHL

CRL OP No. 13103 of 2026

02-06-2026