



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33825 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 10.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.33822 of 2025

1.Sidharth
2. Raguman
3. Rajakumar

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur District.
(Cr.No.1109 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of the arrest or surrender in Crime No.1109 of 2025 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioners : Mr.Sadam Hussain

For Intervenor : Mr.N.Thamizhanban

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(2) of BNS 2023 in Crime No.1109 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that, due to road rage, an altercation arose between the parties while driving their vehicles on a public road. In the said altercation, the petitioners, along with others, allegedly abused and assaulted the de facto complainant with hands and legs and caused severe injuries to him. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that, in respect of the very same occurrence, a counter case has also been registered at the instance of the wife of A2. He further submitted that the de facto complainant was riding his two-wheeler in a rash and negligent manner, which was objected to by A1. Aggrieved by the same, the de facto complainant allegedly abused the petitioners, pursuant to which he called A2 and there was a mutual scuffle between the parties. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the Intervenor submitted that the injured sustained grievous injuries, including fracture to the ribs, and is undergoing treatment due to complications. It is further submitted that the injured is still hospitalized. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that it is a

2/6



case and counter case and that the injured is still in hospital. He further submitted that A2 in this case was arrested and released on bail, A3 has one previous case, and the other accused have no previous cases. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

7. Considering the fact that the occurrence took place on 01.11.2025, that A2 has already been arrested and released on bail, that the petitioners except A3 have no previous cases, and that A3 has only one previous assault case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

8. 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 made, before the learned ***Judicial Magistrate, Palladam*** on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute separate bonds for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** **with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:



(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned 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 petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(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 accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

10.12.2025

Vv



CrI.OP.No.33825 of 20__

To

1. The **Judicial Magistrate, Palladam**

2. The Inspector of Police,
Palladam Police Station,
Tiruppur District.

3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33825 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.33822 of 2025

10.12.2025