



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 17.12.2025

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

1. Kalai Selvaraj
2. Suresh
3. Suresh Kumar
4. Govindhan

. ..Petitioners/ Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu
Rep by the Inspector of Police,
Vadipatti Police Station,
Vadipatti,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.330 of 2025)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.N.Ilango
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.S.S.Manoj
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.R.S.Sivaram

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482
of BNSS



ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners along with other accused persons had trespassed into the Aashram of the defacto complainant and damaged the Aashram Properties and also assaulted the employee of the defacto complainant and criminally intimidated them. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the petitioners are not present at the scene of the occurrence, and they were falsely



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court.

Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) submitted that the petitioners have involved in very serious offence and the investigation is still pending. He further submitted that co-accused anticipatory bail application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.OP(MD).No.19889 of 2025 dated 11.11.2025 and earlier application was dismissed by this Court in CrI.OP(MD).No.20014 of 2025 dated 13.11.2025. Hence, he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant submitted that the petitioners along with other accused persons had attacked the defacto complainant and others, due to which, they sustained injuries. Hence, he strongly opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

6. Upon perusal of the records, it is revealed that the petitioners are devotees of Ramana Ashram, while the defacto complainant claims ownership of the pathway and asserts an easementary right over the same. However, neither party has approached the competent Civil Court to establish their respective claims. This Court has repeatedly held that when a dispute of this nature arises between parties, they must seek appropriate relief before the Civil Court. Despite such observations, the parties have declined to do so, which practice is deprecated. Therefore, the parties are directed to approach the appropriate Civil Court to establish their respective rights. As far as the criminal proceedings are concerned, the respondent is directed to proceed with the matter in accordance with law.

7. Taking into consideration of the above and also the fact that the injured person has been discharged from the hospital, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, with certain conditions.



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

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 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Vadipatti, Madurai District, on condition that each of the petitioner shall execute a 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 respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Vadipatti, Madurai District, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that:

(a) the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of one week and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation.



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

WEB COPY

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(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]* and;

(f) if the accused/petitioner thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS, 2023.

(S S Y J)
17.12.2025

msrm



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1. The learned Judicial Magistrate,
Vadipatti, Madurai District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Vadipatti Police Station,
Vadipatti,
Madurai District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.23245 of 2025

S.SRIMATHY, J.

msrm

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.23245 of 2025**

Date : 17.12.2025