



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05-02-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP Nos.2434 & 2610 of 2026

1.P.Senthilkumar
2.Velcos @ Velkesh V
3.M.Rajkumar
4.P.Arulkumar
5.V.Sakthivel
6.Sathishkumar @ K.Satheeshkumar
7.Blasubiramaniam P.Balasubramaniam
8.Varatharajan @ R.Varadaraj
9.Vijayasekar @ Vijayasekaran
10.Kesavan

..Petitioners
in Crl.OP.No.2434/2026

ABT Mahalingam @ M.Mahalingam

..Petitioner
in Crl.OP.No.2610/2026

Vs

The State Represented by
The Inspector of Police
Udumalpet Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
Crime No.26 of 2026.

Respondent
(in both Crl.OPs.)

COMMON PRAYER : Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on
Page 1 of 7



bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.26 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

WEB COPY

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.A.M.Natraj
(in both Crl.OPs.)

For Respondent(s):

Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl.side)
(in all Crl.OPs.)

COMMON ORDER

The petitioners / A1, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A9, A13, A14 and A15(in Crl.OP.No.2434/2026 and A2 (in Crl.OP.No.2610 of 2026) herein apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 126(2), 296(b), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 5 of the Prevention of Damage to Public Property Act, 1984 in Crime No.26 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they along with their associates, waylaid a car and demanded an increase in poultry rearing charges, obstructed the transportation of chicks from the hatchery to the poultry farm, damaged vehicles, and threatened that no chicks should be transported without their permission. Hence, a case has been registered against the petitioners.



3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are instigated the members of the association to block vehicles carrying chickens either from farms or from hatcheries to poultry farms. He further submitted that the petitioners were not at all present at the scene of occurrence. He further submitted that the protest was only to demand an increase in the price of chicks from Rs.6.50 per kg to Rs.22.71 per kg payable to farmers and that no violence was caused to the vehicle or to any person. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that several cases have been registered across States in respect of similar occurrences and that in the present case, the petitioner, along with other accused, resorted to stopping the movement of the vehicle, thereby causing loss to the hatchery. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6 Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. On perusal of the FIR and other connected materials, it is revealed that the vehicle was being transported and that the persons who intercepted the lorry only demanded that the driver to take back the vehicle and did not



resort to any violence against the driver and insisted on an increase in poultry rearing charges.

8. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case, more particularly that no one was injured in this case and that the case pertains only to a road roko, which resulted in some revenue loss on account of the death of certain chicks, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

9. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the *learned Judicial Magistrate, No.I, Udumalpet, Tiruppur District* on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), each with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;



WEB COPY



(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

05-02-2026

drl



To

WEB COPY

1.The Inspector of Police

Udumalpet Police Station,
Tiruppur District.

2.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Udumalpet, Tiruppur District.

3.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.,

drl

CRL OP Nos.2434 & 2610 of 2026

05.02.2026

Page 7 of 7