



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6529 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 13.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.6529 of 2026

Palani

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep. by,
The Inspector of Police,
Omerabad Police Station,
Tirupattur District.
(Crime No.68 of 2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest pending investigation in Crime No.68 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

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

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence **under Sections 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS (Sec.294(b), 324 and 506(ii) of IPC)** in **Crime No.68 of 2026**, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that due to wordy quarrel the



petitioner assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod and thereby, the defacto complainant sustained injuries. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any such offence as alleged by the defacto complainant and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that he is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that the defacto complainant questioned about the illegal mining done by the petitioner, and that the petitioner got enraged and assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod on 02.03.2026 due to which, the defacto complainant was admitted in the hospital for a period of six days and thereafter discharged only on 08.03.2026; and that the investigation is in preliminary stage. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and also perused the materials available on record.

6. From the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side), it is seen that when the defacto complainant questioned about the



Crl.O.P.No.6529 of 2026

illegal mining done by the petitioner, the petitioner got enraged and assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod on 02.03.2026 and in this regard the defacto complainant took treatment at hospital for a period of six days and thereafter, discharged from the hospital only on 08.03.2026 and that the investigation is in preliminary stage.

7. In view of the above submission, this Court is of the view that it is not desirable to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. At this juncture, though the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there is also a counter case registered by the petitioner against the defacto complainant, the fact remains that the defacto complainant was in the hospital for six days therefore considering the severe nature of injuries sustained by the petitioner and the fact that registration of First Information Report only recently and also due to the pendency of the investigation, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

13.03.2026

ssi

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

ssi

To:

1.The Inspector of Police,
Omerabad Police Station,
Tirupattur District.



2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.6529 of 2026

Crl.O.P.No.6529 of 2026

13.03.2026