



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 08-07-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 17459 of 2026

1. Anjalai
W/o.Arunagiri,
No.516/1,Rettiyar Palayam,Mettupalayam,
Malayanoorchakkadai,
Thiruvannamalai-606601.
2. Sivaji
S/o.Arumugam,
No.35, South Tank Street,
Kadaperi, Tambaram West,
Kancheepuram - 600045.
3. Radhika
W/o.Sivaji,
No. 35, South Tank Street,
Kadaperi, Tambaram west,
Kancheepuram.-600045.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State through The Sub Inspector of Police
Thanipadai Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
Tiruvannamalai - 606601.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest by the respondent police connected with the crime no.122 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): M/s.V.Archana

For Respondent(s): MS.R.S.INDIRA, GOVT.ADVOCATE
(CRL.SIDE)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.122 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the defacto complainant is BDO and the second petitioner is an employee of the Thanipadai Panchaya, was responsible for water supply at Mettupalayma village. As the villagers allegedly complaint to the BDO, with regard to poor water supply, on 22.05.2026 at about 4 pm, the petitioners allegedly way laid the defacto complainant, abused her with filthy language and attacher her. Hence, a case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the defacto complainant and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that they are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that no



previous case has been registered against the petitioners. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) further submitted that the de facto complainant is an Block Development Officer, questioned the improper water supply for agricultural purposes and at that time, the petitioners allegedly threatened her with a wooden log and snatched a 5 sovereign gold chain from her. She further submitted that the injured was admitted in the hospital on 22.05.2026 and was discharged on the same day. The petitioner has been arrayed as A2, A3 and A4. Among them, A2 is the wife of A1, A3 is the brother of A1 and A4 is the wife of A3. Accordingly she opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, taking note of the submissions made by the learned counsel on both sides, it is seen that the alleged occurrence took place on 22.05.2026. The allegation against the petitioner is that she had intimidated and assaulted the de facto complainant, who is BDO, when the petitioner questioned the defacto complainant regarding the non-supply/insufficient supply of water for agricultural purposes. Though such allegations have been levelled against the petitioners, considering the fact that the first petitioner/Accused NO. 2 and third petitioner/ Accused NO.4 are being woman and that the injured was admitted and discharged on the very same day, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners may not be necessary. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to



the petitioners, subject to the following conditions.

WEB COPY

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the learned Principal and Sessions Judge, Thiruvannamalai, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) each, with two sureties each, for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further conditions:

(a) If the petitioners fail to surrender before the concerned learned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The second petitioner/ Accused No.3, shall report before the respondent Police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation; and the 1st and 3rd petitioners /Accused NO. 2 and 4, are directed to report the respondent police, as and when required.



WEB COPY

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

(e) If the petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

08-07-2026

JRS

To

1.The Principal Sessions Judge, Thiruvannamalai.

2.The Sub Inspector of Police
Thanipadai Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
Tiruvannamalai – 606601.

3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 17459 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

JRS

CRL OP No. 17459 of 2026

08-07-2026