



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 8768 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

**CRL MP No. 8768 of 2026
in CrI.OP.No.11766 of 2026**

A.K.Senthilkumar
S/o. Kasirajan,
Advocate,
Residing at East Street,
S. Pudhukuppam,
Kurinjipadi Taluk,
Cuddalore District-607301

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police
Kullanchavadi Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
(Cr.No. 108 of 2026)
2. Shakthivel
S/o. Ramar,
Vasanangkuppam Post,
Panruti Taluk,Cuddalore.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: The Criminal Original filed under Section 483(3) of BNSS, 2023 to cancel the bail granted to the second respondent in CRL.O.P.No.11766 of 2026 dated 13.05.2026.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.Gokulnath.R

For Respondent(s):

Mr.K.Gandhikumar, for R1

Mr.N.Palanivel,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for R2



ORDER

WEB COPY

This petition has been filed to cancel the bail granted to the 2nd respondent herein by order dated 13.05.2026 in Crl.O.P.No.11766 of 2025.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 23.04.2026, due to a dispute arising out of the State Assembly Election, the petitioner along with other accused, allegedly assaulted the defacto complainant and another using a knife and also threatened them with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the second respondent herein had violated the condition mentioned in para 6 (e) namely, that the petitioner shall not induce or threat the petitioner either directly or indirectly. He further submitted that whenever the petitioner walks along the same street, the second respondent allegedly instigates persons to intimidate him by accompanying two bodyguards.

4. However, the said contention was strongly objected by the learned counsel appearing for the second respondent.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) reiterated the said contention and submitted that there is no such occurrence had taken place and



that no complaint in this regard had been received by the respondent police.

WEB COPY

6. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side.

7. Admittedly, the petitioner has not lodged any complaint alleging tampering of witnesses. Even upon perusal of the grounds raised in the petition, it is seen that the petitioner has only expressed a reasonable apprehension that the second respondent may attempt to tamper with the prosecution witnesses. Therefore it is amply clear that, even according to the averments in the petition, no specific instance of violation of the bail condition has been referred to. The petitioner has merely raised an apprehension regarding such violation.

8. It is a well-settled principle of law that the liberty granted by this Court through an order of bail should not be interfered with unless there exists a strong reason. In the case on hand, this Court is unable to find any such strong reason to interfere with the bail order, as already stated, even according to the petitioner, it is only an apprehension, and on the basis of apprehension, bail cannot be cancelled. Hence, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition stands dismissed.

DRL

03-06-2026



To

WEB COPY

1.The Inspector of Police
Kullanchavadi Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 8768 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

DRL

CRL MP No. 8768 of 2026

03-06-2026