



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.35700 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL


CRL OP No. 35700 of 2025

1. Prasanth
S/o. Govindhasamy,
Pattanur Village, Jamunamarathur
Taluk,Tiruvannamalai District.
2. Sivashankar
S/o. Govindhasamy, Pattanur Village,
Jamunamarathur Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai District,
3. Govindhasamy,
S/o. Raman,
Pattanur Village, Jamunamarathur
Taluk,Tiruvannamalai District.
Pattanur Village, Jamunamarathur
Taluk,Tiruvannamalai District.
4. Samanthi,
S/o. Govindhasamy Pattanur Village,
Jamunamarathur Taluk,Tiruvannamalai
District

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep. by Inspector of Police,



Crl.O.P.No.3576 of 2025

Jamunamarathur Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
Crime No.123 of 2025

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

This petition has been filed to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.123 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): E.Sathiyaraj Elangovan

For Respondent(s): S.Udaya Kumar, GA

ORDER

The petitioners / Accused Nos.1 to 4, who apprehend arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 (corresponding Section 294(b), 323, 324, 506(2) of IPC) in connection with Cr.No.123 of 2025, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a property dispute between the defacto complainant's relative one Velli and the 3rd petitioner and on 11.12.2025 at about 05.15 a.m., when the defacto complainant went and prevented their quarrel, the petitioners viz, A1 and A2 attacked the defacto complainant with knife and threatened with dire consequences and also caused injuries to him. Hence, based on the complaint of the defacto complainant, a case was registered against the petitioners.



WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners have not committed the offences as alleged by the prosecution and there was a property dispute between the 3rd petitioner and the relative of the defacto complainant and he was discharged from the hospital. He further submits that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent conditions imposed by this Court. Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submits that a wordy quarrel arose between the petitioners/accused and the defacto complainant and caused injuries to the defacto complainant and he was discharged from the hospital. Hence, he opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner as well the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the nature of offences and that there was quarrel between the 3rd petitioner and one Velli, who is the relative of the defacto complainant and when she intervened, this occurrence was happened, no previous case is pending against the



petitioner and the defacto complainant was discharged from the hospital, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners subject to the following conditions.

7. 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, Polur, Thiruvannamalai District, on condition that the petitioners shall execute separate bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioners shall report before the respondent on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of four weeks.

[b] the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

[c] the petitioners shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

[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



Crl.O.P.No.3576 of 2025

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].

WEB COPY

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.2023.

30.12.2025

dn

Index:Yes/No

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

Note :

- 1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the official website of this Court.*
- 2. All concerned shall act on this order being uploaded in the official website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.*

To

1. The State rep. by Inspector of Police,
Jamunamarathur Police Station, Tiruvannamalai District.
2. learned Judicial Magistrate, Polur, Thiruvannamalai District



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.35700 of 2025

P. DHANABAL.J,

dn

Crl.O.P.No.35700 of 2025

30.12.2025