

WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 13178 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. 13178 of 2026

Sanjay

..Petitioner

Vs

The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
Thimmampettai Police Station,
Thirupathur District.
(Crime No.20 of 2025)

..Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the Petitioner/2nd Accused on Anticipatory Bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.20 of 2025 pending investigation on file of the Respondent Police (Thimmampettai Police Station, Tirupathur District).

For Petitioner:

Mr.C.Ravi

For Respondent:

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

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 194 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (under Section 174 of Criminal Procedure Code) subsequently altered into 333, 103(1), 238, 61(2)(a) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 (under Sections 452, 302, 201, 120(B) of Indian Penal Code, 1860) in Crime No.20 of 2025 on the file of the




respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against this petitioner/ A2 is that, the petitioner had an illicit intimacy with the wife of the deceased, who is arrayed as A1 in this case, since this intimacy was questioned by the deceased, the petitioner herein engaged other accused to murder the deceased and subsequently, other accused conspired between them and entered into the house of the deceased and murdered the deceased, while he was sleeping. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner at the relevant point of time was abroad. He further submitted 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 learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that this is the 2nd application and he further submitted that there are no records to substantiate the said contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, taking note of the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides, taking into consideration of the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner was abroad at the relevant time, was rightly objected by the learned Govt Advocate (Crl.Side), who submitted that there are no records to substantiate the said contention. Considering the seriousness of the allegation, this Court is of the firm view that it is not appropriate to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

02-06-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No


SHL

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Vaniyambadi, Tirupathur District

2. The Inspector of Police,
Thimmampettai Police Station,
Thirupathur District.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 13178 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

SHL

CRL OP No. 13178 of 2026

02-06-2026