



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 7821 of 2026

1.Sridhar

S/o. Malaiappan,
No.21, Senga Gounder Street,
Padaikuppam, Alangayam,
Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

2.Seenivasan Mohan

S/o. Mohan Alraja,
No.3, Kamarajar Street,
Alangayam, Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

3.Silambarasan

S/o. Raja,
No. 21, Pamandi Chinnapaiyan Street,
Alangayam,
Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

4.Kalaiselvi

W/o.Sridhar,
No.21, Senga Gounder Street,
Padaikuppam,
Alangayam,
Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

5.Jayapriya

D/o.Sridhar,
No.21, Senga Gounder Street,
Padaikuppam,
Alangayam,
Vaniyambadi Taluk,
Tirupathur District.

..Petitioner(s)



Vs

State rep by the Inspector of Police
Alangayam Police Station,
Alangayam,
Tirupathur District,
Cr.No. 29/2026.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No. 29/2026 on the file of the Inspector of Police, Alangayam Police Station, Alangayam, Tirupathur District and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s):

G.Vinodhkumar

For Respondent(s):

Mr.P.Dhileepan

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 115(2) and 118(1) of BNS in Crime No. 29 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that, due to a wordy quarrel, the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with hands and legs and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are



innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. He also submitted that the first petitioner is a senior citizen and that the occurrence arose out of a wordy quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant. It is further submitted that the occurrence took place on 18.03.2026, and immediately thereafter A2 was remanded to judicial custody and subsequently released on bail on 26.03.2026 which fact has not been seriously disputed. Hence, he prayed for anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that there are no previous cases against the petitioners. However, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. On a perusal of the materials, this Court finds that petitioners 4 and 5 are women and that the co-accused have already been released on bail. It is also seen that the entire issue arose when the defacto complainant questioned the road laid by the first petitioner. This Court also takes into cognizance the fact



that there is a counter case against the defacto complainant.

WEB COPY

7. Considering the totality of the circumstances, including the age of the first petitioner, the gender of petitioners 4 and 5, and the discharge of the defacto complainant from the hospital, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required at this stage. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail, subject to the following stringent conditions:

8. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before **the learned Judicial Magistrate-III, Tirupathur**, on condition that **the petitioners shall execute a separate 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 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 stay at Madurai and report to the Inspector of Police, C1 Thideer Nagar Police Station, daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks. Thereafter, the petitioners shall appear before the respondent police and sign daily at 10.30 a.m., for a further period of one week and 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 petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

MPA

27-03-2026



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 7821 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

MPA

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-III, Tirupathur.
2. The Inspector of Police
Alangayam Police Station,
Alangayam,
Tirupathur District,
Cr.No. 29/2026.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CRL OP No. 7821 of 2026

27-03-2026