Order QR

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.RAMESH

CRL OP No. 30858 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012563752026}

1. Isaivalavan
2. Sanjay

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep. by,
The Sub Inspector of Police
Chengam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
Crime No.270 of 2026. ..Respondent(s)

PRAYER :

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the Petitioners on bail in the event of their arrst in Cr.No.270 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the Respondent Police and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. H Abdul Muthalif

For Respondent(s): Mr. R.Rajasekaran,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS in Crime No.**270 of 2026** on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 01.10.2026 at about 5:30 p.m., while the de facto complainant was returning from the village, the accused persons, who were under the influence of alcohol, were shouting and dancing on the road. When the de facto complainant requested them to make way, the accused persons abused him in filthy language and assaulted him with stones, thereby causing grievous injuries, and further threatened him with dire consequences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and a false case has been foisted against the petitioners and that they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent State/police reiterated the prosecution's case and

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

submitted that the de facto complainant's friend sustained injuries requiring three stitches to the head, while the de facto complainant sustained injuries requiring eight stitches to the head. Given the nature of the injuries, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to either side submissions.

6. Having considered the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the allegations, the specific overt acts attributed to the petitioners, and the medical evidence indicating that the victims sustained grievous head injuries requiring multiple stitches, this Court is of the considered view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners may be required for effective investigation. Under such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant the relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

23-10-2026

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

MFA

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate,

2.The Sub Inspector of Police
Chengam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Chennai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

N.RAMESH, J.

MFA

CRL OP No. 30858 of 2026

23-10-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis