



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 3273 of 2026

1. Dr. M. Gopinathan
2. Mrs. G. Chandhya
3. Mr.Nirmal Sharavanan
4. Mrs. Priyanka

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State represented by

The Inspector of Police,
T-14 Mangadu Police station,

Avadi

Cr.No.52 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This petition is filed under Section 482 of BNSS To enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of his arrest by the respondent police in Cr.No.52 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the The Inspector of Police, T-14 Mangadu Police station, Avadi

For Petitioner: Mr.S. Thiruvengadam



For Intervenor : Mr. Swami Subramanian

For Respondent : Ms. J. Archana, Government Advocate(Crl Side)

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) f BNSS , 2023 and Section 4 of the TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act in Crime No.52 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioners herein are creating nuisance to the neighbours who are residing in the apartment during the midnight. Hence, the defacto complainant and his daughter went to the petitioners house/flat and questioned them. Due to which the petitioners attacked the defacto complainant and his daughter and caused grievous injuries to them which resulted in lodging the F.I.R.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioners have not attacked the defacto complainant and there was only a wordy quarrel among them. He further submitted that a false case has been foisted against the petitioners and counter case was also registered regarding the occurrence, the petitioners are ready to co-operate with the investigation and



abide by any other stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court.

Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that with a intention to cause severe injuries, the petitioners have attacked the defacto complainant and his daughter, and caused injuries to them. He further submitted that due to the continuos disturbance created by the petitioners, they are unable to reside in their house. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners are creating continuos disturbance to the residence of the apartments and when it was questioned by the defacto complainant they attacked the defacto complainant and her daughter and caused injuries to them. He further submitted that the injured discharge from the hospital and there is no previous case pending against the petitioners. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by both counsel; injured discharged from the hospital; the manner in which the occurrence has taken place; there is no previous case pending against the petitioners. I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.



8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate Court at Sriperumbudur** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioners 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 petitioners 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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]***;

WEB COPY

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

17-02-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

smn

To.

1. The **Judicial Magistrate Court at Sriperumbudur**

2. The Inspector of Police,
T-14 Mangadu Police station,
Avadi

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



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.3273 of 2



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

SMN

CRL OP No. 3273 of 2026

17-02-2026

1/2