



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.No.21334 of 2025
in Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 02.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.M.P.No.21334 of 2025
in
Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011

G.Subramaniam

...Petitioner

-VS-

1.State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
Pallipalayam Police Station,
Namakkal.

2.S.Balu (A1)

3.S.Aasai Thambi (A2)

4.P.Kuppusamy (A4)

...Respondents

PRAYER : Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 483(3) of BNSS, 2023, praying to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondents 2 to 4 / accused vide order dated 18.01.2011 in Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Kolandasamy

For R1 : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R2 to R4 : Mr.Sriganesh



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.No.21334 of 2025
in Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011

ORDER

This petition has been filed to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondents 2 to 4 / accused vide order dated 18.01.2012 in Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the respondent police station has been wrongly referred as the Inspector of Police instead of CBCID, and it is the further submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that in the registration certificate of the vehicle bearing No.TN 33 L 4527, there was fabrication and thereby the records were tampered with.

3. While looking into the above submissions in the cause title, the Inspector of Police, Pallipalayam Police Station, is shown as the respondent instead of CBCID, where the investigation is pending. Therefore, admittedly, the correct police station has not been shown. But, while the order was passed, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) was present and he had effectively represented the case. Therefore, the prosecution was not in a position of disadvantage in defending the State, and only after considering the



Crl.M.P.No.21334 of 2025
in Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011

WEB COPY

submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), anticipatory bail was granted on 18.01.2012.

4. The learned counsel would further submit that there were certain fabrications and manipulations in the vehicle records. But admittedly these fabrications had taken place prior to the grant of anticipatory bail. Therefore, it is amply clear that those allegations were already in existence at the time of granting bail. Therefore, such irregularities that have now come to light cannot be a ground to cancel the anticipatory bail, as the cancellation of anticipatory bail is a serious matter and cannot be entertained for flimsy reasons. Hence, this Court does not find any merits in the present application.

5. Accordingly, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition stands dismissed.

cda

02.04.2026



WEB COPY



Crl.M.P.No.21334 of 2025
in Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Pallipalayam Police Station,
Namakkal.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.M.P.No.21334 of 2025
in
Crl.O.P.No.367 of 2011

02.04.2026