



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12890 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-05-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 12890 of 2026

Praveenkumar @ Appu

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State rep.by,
Inspector of Police,
Kanchi Taluk Police Station,
Kanchipuram District.
Cr.No.136 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in connection with the Cr.No.136 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police and pass such order or further orders as this Hon'ble court.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.D.Padmanabhan

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Balaji
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 309(4), 311, and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 and Section 25(1)(a) of the Arms Act in Crime No. 136 of 2026, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the respondent police received a complaint from the de-facto complainant alleging that while he was proceeding on the road, some unknown persons wrongfully restrained him, abused him in filthy language, threatened him at knife point, and robbed a sum of Rs. 2,000/-. Based on the complaint, an FIR was registered. During the course of the investigation, the petitioner herein was implicated based on the confession statement of the co-accused and arrayed as Accused No. 4. Hence the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person, the entire complaint is false, and he has been falsely implicated in the present case. He further submitted that the FIR copy is not visible or uploaded on the official website portal of the respondent police. He stated that this is the first anticipatory bail application before this Court and no other bail application is pending in any other court. He further submitted that the main accused has already been secured and was subsequently granted bail. He admitted that there are some previous cases pending against the petitioner, but bail has already been granted to him in all of those cases. He stated that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed anticipatory bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the



petitioner has been arrayed as Accused No. 4 and has some previous cases pending against him. However, he conceded that the main accused has already

been granted bail and that the petitioner was granted bail in his previous cases.

Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the Petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the nature of offences, the fact that the main accused has already been secured and released on bail, and also the fact that the petitioner has been granted bail in all his pending previous cases, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate No. II, Kanchipuram on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs. 10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.00 a.m. until further orders and as and when required for interrogation;



[b] the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

[c] the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560];

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNSS, 2023.

14-05-2026

SHA



Note:

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.

2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.

To:

1. The Judicial Magistrate No. II,
Kanchipuram.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Kanchi Taluk Police Station,
Kanchipuram District.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12890 of 2



P.DHANABAL, J.

SHA

CRL OP No. 12890 of 2026

14-05-2026