

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 3409 of 2026

Sathayanarayanan Silcal

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State rep.by, Inspector of Police,
Race Course Police Station,
Coimbatore City.
Crime.No.50 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of BNSS to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in connection with Cr.No.50 of 2026 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.V.Raghavachari, Senior Advocate for
Mr.C.Gunasekaran

For Intervnor: Mr.R.Sivakumar
for M/s.Vindhya Vasini

Mr.K.Madhu for one of the victim

For Respondent(s): Ms.J.R.Archana, GA (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) & 329 (3) of BNS and 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 in connection with the Cr.No.50 of 2026, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegations against the petitioner are that the petitioner trespassed into the premises of the school run by the defacto compliant, abused the persons managing the school, including the defacto complainant, and assaulted her. The petitioner along with certain others, attacked the staff and caused grievous injuries. The FIR further states that CCTV cameras were installed facing the school premises and the car parking area of the defacto complainant' school, thereby affecting the privacy of the school children. Hence, the case has been registered.

3. Mr.V.Raghavachari, learned senior counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that there is a civil litigation pending between the parties and that, on account of the said dispute, the present complaint has been lodged out of vengeance. It is further submitted that the petitioner had installed CCTV cameras solely for the purpose of protecting his property and the petitioner is also willing to restrict the CCTV coverage area strictly to his own property. It is further stated that the defacto complainant along with others have attacked the petitioner, however, an FIR has been registered against the petitioner suppressing the above facts. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Mr.R.Sivakumar, learned counsel for the Intervenor/defacto complainant submitted that though a civil court order is claimed to be in favour

of the petitioner, he has no right to enter into the school premises. He also attacked the lady who is running the school and caused severe injuries. It is further submitted that four other cases of a similar in nature are pending against the petitioner. Therefore, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Mr.K.Madhu, learned counsel appearing for one of the victims submitted that the petitioner had brutally assaulted him, causing head injuries, and that if the petitioner is released on bail, he may indulge in similar offences. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Ms.J.R.Archana, learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police, submitted that the petitioner not only trespassed into the school premises and assaulted the persons managing the institution, but also attacked the driver and other staff members. It is further submitted that the investigation is still in progress and therefore, prayed for dismissal of the petition.

7. Considering the nature of the allegations, and the fact that several litigation are pending between the parties, which appear to have resulted in the present occurrence and taking note of the fact that the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary to investigate the nature of this

case and the submissions by the learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is willing to restrict the coverage area of the CCTV cameras to his own property, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to the following 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 ready, before the learned ***Additional Mahila Court, Coimbatore*** on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty 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 petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am., for a period three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

[b] the petitioner shall restrict the coverage area of the CCTV cameras and shall permit the Investigating Officer to verify the footage to ensure compliance.

[c] the petitioner 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 or tamper with the evidence;

[d] the petitioner 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.

19-02-2026
(1/2)

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

JAI

To
1. Inspector of Police,
Race course police station,
Coimbatore City.

2. The Additional Mahila Court, Coimbatore.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

JAI

CRL OP No. 3409 of 2026

**19-02-2026
(1/2)**