

Suresh Vs The State, Represented by the Inspector of Police,

Suresh Vs The State, Represented by the Inspector of Police,

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1419052

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Jan-29-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Rajasekar

Appeal No. : CRL OP/1904/2026

Appellant : Suresh

Respondent : The State, Represented by the Inspector of Police,

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29-01-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

1. Suresh

2. Prasanth. P

3. Ajith

..Petitioner(s) Vs The State, Represented by the Inspector of Police, (Crime No. 461 of 2025) ..Respondent(s) Prayer: This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of BNSS to grant Anticipatory Bail to the Petitioners/Accused Nos. 1 to 3 in the event of their arrest by the Respondent Police in connection with Crime No. 461/2025 on the file of the Kunnam Police Station, Perambalur District, registered for offences under Section 137(2) of BNS and Sections 7 and 8 of the POCSO Act,. For Petitioner(s): Mr.E. Sathiyamoorthi For Respondent(s): Ms.J.R.Archana, GA (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for offences punishable under Section 137(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Page1 of 4 Sanhita (BNS) and Sections 7 & 8 of the Protection of Children from Sexual Offences (POCSO) Act, in connection with Crime No. 461 of 2025, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner lured the victim

girl, aged 16 years, under the pretext of love, kidnapped her to various locations, and committed sexual assault. The second and third petitioners are alleged to have aided and abetted the first petitioner in the abduction. Following a complaint lodged by the victim's family, the girl was subsequently secured.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners

are innocent and have been falsely implicated. It is contended that this is not a case of kidnapping, as the victim accompanied them voluntarily. He further submitted that the second and third petitioners had no role in the alleged offence and that all petitioners are willing to cooperate with the investigation. On these grounds, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), appearing for the

respondent police, vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail. She placed reliance on the statement of the victim recorded under Section 183 of the BNSS, which unequivocally details the involvement of the accused in the alleged crime. She further submitted that the investigation is at a crucial stage. Page2 of 4

5. I have perused the statement of the victim girl recorded under Section

183 of the BNSS. The statement reveals that the petitioners compelled the victim to travel with them, forcibly transporting her in a car from her native place to Villupuram and subsequently to Pollachi. Considering the gravity of the allegations involving sexual assault on a minor and the specific roles attributed to each petitioner, this Court is of the view that if anticipatory bail is granted, it would hamper the investigation.

6. Considering the heinous nature of the offence and the incriminating material available at this stage, this Court is not inclined to grant the anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed. Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No JAI Page3 of 4

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

JAI To

1. The Inspector of Police,

2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras. Page4 of 4