



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.6041 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.6041 of 2026

1.Renu
2.Mannu
3.Saranya

... Petitioners

Vs.

State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Mangalam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.
(Crime No. 21 of 2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.21 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.Sathiyaraj

For Respondent : Mr. P. Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 324(4), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.21 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that due to a property dispute



between the petitioners and the defacto complainant, on the date of the alleged occurrence, the petitioners attacked the defacto complainant with an iron rod and also threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to either side submissions.

6. From the submissions made by the learned counsel for the petitioners, it is seen that this is a case where the first accused allegedly assaulted the defacto complainant with an iron rod, the second accused assaulted him with a wooden log and the third accused attacked him with a broom. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is seen that the defacto complainant was admitted in the hospital for a period of four days and was later discharged. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



further submitted that if the accused are enlarged on bail, it may affect the proper course of investigation. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 3rd accused being a woman and that her specific overt act is very minor in nature.

7. Considering the submissions made by both side counsel and taking into account the overt acts attributed to the accused, this Court is of the view that the main overt acts are attributed against A1 and A2. In view of the seriousness of the offence and the injuries sustained by the defacto complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to A1 and A2 and this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed with regard to A1 and A2 are concerned. However, considering the overt act attributed to A3 and the fact that she is a woman, this Court is inclined to enlarge the third petitioner on anticipatory bail with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the third 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 is made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tiruvannamalai** on condition that **the third 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 conditions:

(a) If the third petitioner fails to surrender before the



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.6041 c



concerned learned 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 third petitioner 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;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the third petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the third petitioner 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 petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

9.In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed insofar as the third petitioner is concerned, and dismissed insofar as the first and second petitioners are concerned.

09.03.2026

DRL



To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Tiruvannamalai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Mangalam Police Station,
Tiruvannamalai District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.6041 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN.J.

DRL

Crl.OP.No.6041 of 2026

09.03.2026