



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 3804 of 2026

1. S. Kumar

2. K. Manimegalai

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State represented by

The Inspector of Police,

Jayankondam Police Station,

Jayankondam

Ariyalur District

..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.97 of 2026 dated 09.02.2026 on the file of the of The Inspector of Police, Jayankondam Police Station,Jayankondam Ariyalur District

For Petitioners

:Mr. E. Thiyaga for B. Balavijayan



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.3804 of 2



For Respondent

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

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(B), 115(2), 118(2), 351(3) of BNS Act and Section 4 of Tamilnadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act- 1998 in Crime No.97 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there was property dispute among the petitioners and the defacto complainant. Due to which the petitioners along with other accused have damaged the compound wall belonging to the defacto complainant and attacked the defacto complainant with stones and also caused injuries to 3 persons. Hence, the present case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that due to property dispute a false case has been foisted against the petitioners and the petitioners have not used any weapons and there was only a wordy quarrel between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. He further submitted that



the petitioners have also sustained injuries and admitted in the hospital and a counter case was also registered. He further submitted that the petitioners have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution and he is 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.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that this petitioners along with other accused have damaged the compound wall belonging to the defacto complainant and attacked the defacto complainant with stones and caused injuries to 3 persons. He further submitted that there is no previous case pending against the petitioners and the injured discharged from the hospital . However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by both counsel; injured discharged; nature of offence there



is no previous case pending against the petitioners. I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are 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 -I, Jayankondam** on condition that the petitioners 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]***;

(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 -I, Jayankondam**

2. The Inspector of Police,
Jayankondam Police Station,
Jayankondam

Ariyalur District

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



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.3804 of 2



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

smn

CRL OP No. 3804 of 2026

17-02-2026