

CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 14/07/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026

1. SM.Meeran Mydeen @ Meera Mydeen

2. Beer Fathima ... Petitioners/Accused No.1 & 2

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai City,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.210 of 2026).

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.210 of 2026 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioners : M/s.Thanga Aravindh,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.J.Vishnu,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : Mr.K.Pandiarajan
Advocate.



CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026


ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS Act, 2023, in Crime No.523 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that due to the tenancy dispute, the petitioners have instigated one Shanmugaraj and the accordingly, the said Shanmugaraj taken away the goods worth about Rs.2,00,000/- from the defacto complainant's shop. Hence, the case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are the landlord and they have been falsely implicated in this case and some other accused have involved in the offence and the properties have already been recovered and the petitioners herein are ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The learned Counsel For State of TN (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and, on instructions, submitted that in this case, though almost all the properties have been recovered, the defacto complainant states that some more properties have to be recovered, but there is no such list that has been produced, and he further submitted that the petitioners, by engaging Shanmugaraj, took away the goods and the investigation in this case is pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that though goods worth about Rs.200,000/- were stolen from the shop of the de facto complainant, some of the goods have to be recovered. If the petitioners released on bail, there is no such possibility of recover the remaining goods. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail.

6. I have gone through the FIR and also the connected materials.

7. Considering the nature of allegations against the petitioners, and also considering the fact that majority of the properties have been



CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026

recovered and the petitioners are senior citizen and due to tenancy dispute, there is a dispute between the parties, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a 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 learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and on further conditions that:

[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 the interrogation.

[c] the petitioners shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.



CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026

WEB COPY

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial 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].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

14.07.2026

dss

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Subramaniapuram Police Station,
Madurai City, Madurai District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.12865 of 2026

K. RAJASEKAR,J

DSS

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.12865 of 2026

Date : 14/07/2026