



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 28145 of 2025

Raghunathan Narayanan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. Syed Adnan
2. Nisar Ahmed
3. The State rep. by,
Inspector of Police,
Thalambur Police Station
Chennai-600 130.
Cr.No.230 of 2025

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 483(3) of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, to cancel the Bail, which was granted vide Impugned Order dated 09.09.2025 made in CrI.MP.No.2758 of 2025, on the file of the Principal District and Sessions Judge, Chengalpet and to commit the respondents 1 and 2 herein to custody, pending investigation in Crime No.230 of 2025, on the file of the 3rd respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.Dinesh Kumar


For Respondent(s): Mr.N.Palanivel
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

**ORDER**

The Criminal Original Petition has been filed to cancel the bail granted vide the impugned order dated 09.09.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.2758 of 2025 by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Chengalpattu, and to commit respondents 1 and 2 herein to custody pending investigation in Crime No.230 of 2025 on the file of the 3rd respondent police.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that vide the bail order dated 09.09.2025, the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge granted anticipatory bail to the respondents 1 and 2 herein. However, it is the specific contention of the petitioner that a condition was imposed directing the respondents not to tamper with witnesses or hamper the investigation in any manner. Despite this, the respondents intimidated the petitioner, in connection with which a subsequent FIR was registered, constraining the petitioner to approach this Court.

3. However, the learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2 invited the attention of this Court to the date of the bail order, i.e., 09.09.2025. According to the respondents' counsel, the alleged occurrence relied upon by the petitioner to seek cancellation of bail took place on 17.07.2025, which happened prior to the grant of anticipatory bail order.



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

WEB COPY

5. While looking into the factual position, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the respondents 1 and 2, anticipatory bail was granted on 09.09.2025 with certain conditions. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner contended that the condition the imposed were violated, it was rightly submitted by the respondents' counsel that for the FIR registered on 17.07.2025, the alleged occurrence took place on 14.07.2025, well before the bail order granted quo on 09.09.2025.

6. Therefore, this Court is of the firm view that no grounds have been made out by the petitioner. Under such circumstances, there is no merit in this Criminal Original Petition and stands dismissed.

16-06-2026

Index: Yes/No


Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Jeni

To

- 1.The Principal District and Sessions Judge, Chengapattu.
- 2.The Inspector of Police, Thalambur Police Station, Chennai.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Jeni

CRL OP No. 28145 of 2025

16-06-2026