



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-06-2026

WEB COPY

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 13518 of 2026

Karunamoorthy @ Paneer

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
T-11, Thiruninravur Police Station,
Thiruvallur District,
Crime No.121 of 2026

..Respondent(s)


Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, to enlarge the petitioner/accused herein on Bail in Crime No.121 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.Gnanasekar

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Yogaraja Sekar
Counsel for Government of Tamil Nadu
(Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody for alleged offences punishable under Sections 189(4), 125, and 61(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, read with Section 25(1A) of the Arms Act, 1959, and Sections 4 and 5 of the Explosive Substances Act, 1908, in the



file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that, acting on secret information, the respondent police learned that one Arul, an accused in the murder case of BSP Tamil Nadu State President Mr.Armstrong, who was out on bail, was regularly travelling in his white Triber car to comply with his bail conditions at the Court near Thirunindravur. The petitioner, along with other accused persons, followed the said Arul in their cars while holding deadly weapons, including knives, and possessed weapons in a manner threatening to the public. Hence, the accused were arrested at the scene.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and not connected with the offences alleged in the complaint. It is further submitted that the petitioner has been in incarceration for a considerable period; hence, the counsel prayed for the grant of bail.

4. The said contention was strongly opposed by the learned Government Counsel (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent, who submitted that the petitioner was arrested along with serious arms while attempting a retaliation attack. He further submitted that there is two previous case pending against the petitioner.



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

WEB COPY


6. Taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances, and the submissions made by the learned Government Counsel which disclose that this incident constitutes a severe retaliation attempt. The petitioner was arrested for the possession of serious, deadly arms. If enlarged in bail the same would cause grave repercussions in society. In view of the nature and gravity of the offence, the dangerous potential of a retaliatory strike, so also the criminal antecedents against petitioner, and the overall threat to public peace, this Court is not inclined to grant bail at this stage.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

08-06-2026

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

Jeni



To

WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-II, Thiruvallur.
- 2.The Superintendent, Central Prison-II, Puzhal, Chennai.
- 3.The Inspector of Police, T-11, Thiruninravur Police Station, Thiruvallur District.
- 4.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 13518 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Jeni

CRL OP No. 13518 of 2026

08-06-2026