



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.35697 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 35697 of 2025

1. K. Ravi
S/o. Kuppusamy, No.178, Mariyamman
Kovil Street, Perumanam Village,
Tiruvannamalai District

2.S Sekar
S/o. Semmalai, No.182, Mariyamman Kovil
Street, Perumanam Village, Tiruvannamalai
District.

3. Suriyaparthap
S/o. Arumugam, No.31, Mariyamman Kovil
Street, Perumanam Village, Tiruvannamalai
District.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Veraiyur Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

This petition has been filed to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No. 245 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3569 of 2025

For Petitioner(s): E.Sathiyaraj Elangovan

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

ORDER

The petitioners / Accused Nos.1 to 3, who apprehend arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023(Corresponding SectionS 294(b), 324, 506(2) IPC) in connection with Cr.No.245 of 2025, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 16.12.2025, there was a wordy quarrel between the petitioners/accused and the defacto complainant since the cattle of the 1st petitioner were grazing in the land of the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant was attacked and sustained injuries. Hence, based on the complaint of the defacto complainant, a case was registered against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submit that the petitioners have not committed the offences as alleged by the prosecution and there was a dispute regarding cultivating the lands and the petitioners have been falsely implicated in the case. 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.



WEB COPY

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 it is a wordy quarrel picked up by the petitioners with the defacto complainant over a land dispute and as the defacto complainant was discharged from the hospital and no previous case is pending against the petitioner, 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 No.I, Thiruvannamalai District, on condition that the petitioners shall execute separate bond



Crl.O.P.No.3569/131/2023

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 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].

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

30.12.2025

dn



Crl.O.P.No.3569/1/2023

Index:Yes/No

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

WEB COPY

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
The Inspector of Police,
Veraiyur Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

2.Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thiruvannamalai District



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.35697 of 2025

P. DHANABAL

dn

Crl.O.P.No.35697 of 2025

30.12.2025