

Varatharaj Vs The State rep.by,

Varatharaj Vs The State rep.by,

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1435233

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Mar-30-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice C.Kumarappan

Appeal No. : CRL OP/7989/2026

Appellant : Varatharaj

Respondent : The State rep.by,

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN Varatharaj S/o. Radhakrishnan, No.8/1193B, EB Colony, Lakshmi Nagar, Kalingariyanpalayam, Podur, Erode District. ..Petitioner(s) Vs The State represented by: The Inspector of Police, Shoolagiri Police Station, Krishnagiri District. [Cr.No.16 of 2026] ..Respondent(s) PRAYER: The Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 483 of B.N.S.S. praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with the case in Crime No.16 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the respondent

police. For Petitioner(s): M/S. C.Harish For Respondent(s): Mr. S. Vinoth Kumar, Government Advocate (Criminal side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 10.01.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 140(2) of B.N.S. altered to Sections 140(2), 191, 192 and 204 of B.N.S in Cr. No.16 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail. Page1 of 4

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 07.01.2026, the accused waylaid the defacto complainant, abducted him and threatened him at knife point and demanded ransom amount from the defacto complainant and hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner

is an innocent and he is under incarceration since 10.01.2026. It is the further submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that though the prosecution is that the petitioner along with other accused abducted the defacto complainant and demanded ransom amount, there is an online transaction of only Rs.1,300/- and therefore, considering the long incarceration of the petitioner from 10.01.2026, prayed to enlarge the petitioners on bail.

4. At this juncture, the Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing

for the respondent police would submit that there are totally 5 accused and the petitioner is A4 and one of the accused is still absconding. He would further submit that the defacto complainant was abducted for ransom amount, but unfortunately, the accused had only obtained Rs.1,300/- and the petitioner has one previous case and one of the co-accused is yet to be arrested and hence he strongly opposed the bail application.

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

6. From the submissions of the learned Government Advocate, it is clear

that though an amount of Rs.1,300/- only was received by the accused, the accused had abducted the defacto complainant for ransom amount, considering the nature of allegations and the bad antecedent of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. MJS Note:

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.

2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this

Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code. To

1. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

2. The Inspector of Police, Shoolagiri Police Station, Krishnagiri District.. Page3 of 4

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

MJS Page4 of 4

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com