



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 109 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL MP No. 109 of 2026

in

CrI.O.P.No.831 of 2025

V.V.Varadarajan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep by
The Inspector of Police
Beta-II, EDF-I,
Central Crime Branch,
Vepery, Chennai.
Cr.No.88 of 2024.

2. R. Shankar

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This criminal miscellaneous petition is filed under Section 483(3) of BNSS to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the 2nd respondent / accused in CrI.O.P.No.831 of 2025 dated 12.02.2025 and thereby commit the 2nd respondent /accused to custody.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.Mohamed Muzammil

For Respondent(s): Mr.P.Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for R1
Mr.A.Ramesh Manikandan for R2

ORDER

This criminal miscellaneous petition has been filed to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the second respondent / accused in CrI.O.P.No.831



of 2025 dated 12.02.2025 and thereby, to commit the second respondent / accused to custody as that the petitioner has violated the conditions stipulated by this Court in the order dated 12.02.2025 in Crl.O.P.No.831 of 2025.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the present application has been filed only on the ground that the second respondent / accused has violated the conditions stipulated in paragraph No.8(d) of the earlier order passed by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.831 of 2025 dated 12.02.2025. As per the said condition, the second respondent was restrained from tampering with evidence or influencing the witnesses either during the course of investigation or trial. In this regard, the learned counsel for the petitioner specifically submitted that the second respondent had intimidated the witnesses and, pursuant thereto, a complaint was lodged and a CSR was registered in CSR.No.1201 of 2025 dated 25.10.2025.

4. The said contention was, however, objected to by the learned counsel for the second respondent.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to the submission made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. At this juncture, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



appearing for the first respondent police submits that though initially the CSR was registered, the same was subsequently closed. Therefore, this Court is of the view that there are no prima facie materials available to arrive at a conclusion that the second respondent had tampered with the witnesses or evidence either during the course of investigation or trial. Hence, this Court finds no merits in the present application seeking cancellation of anticipatory bail.

7. Accordingly, this criminal miscellaneous petition stands dismissed.

11-03-2026

rap



CRL MP No. 109 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

rap

WEB COPY

To

1. The Inspector of Police
Beta-II, EDF-I, Central Crime Branch,
Vepery, Chennai - 600 007.
Cr.No.88 of 2024.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CRL MP No. 109 of 2026

11-03-2026



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 109 of 2

