



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9066 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 9066 of 2026

1.Kesavan
S/o.Vinayagam,
Residing at,
Mariyamman Koil Street,
Soganur, Arakkonam Taluk,
Ranipet District.

2.Vinoth
S/o.Vijayan,
Residing at,
Mariyamman Koil Street,
Soganur, Arakkonam Taluk,
Ranipet District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

STate rep by its, The Inspector of Police,
ARAKKONAM TALUK POLICE STATION,
Ranipet District.
(Crime No. 114 of 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 connection with
in Crime No.114 of 2026 pending on the file of the Respondent Police and thus
render justice.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.D.Dayalan

For Respondent(s):

MR.P.DHILEEPAN,
GOVT.ADVOCATE (CRL SIDE)



ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.114 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that a wordy quarrel arose between the petitioners and the defacto complainant on account of an alleged illicit relationship between the defacto complainant and the wife of A2. In the course of the said quarrel, the defacto complainant is stated to have sustained injuries. Hence, a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the occurrence took place on 12.03.2026 and that it is a case and case in counter. He further submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. 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 there are three accused in this case and the petitioners herein are A2 and A3. He further submitted that A1 had also sustained grievous injuries



and was enlarged on bail on the medical grounds and that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. He further submitted that A3/Vinoth has got one previous case against him. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

6. Considering the totality of the circumstances of the case, the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that the second petitioner/A3 has one previous case, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed with respect of second petitioner/A3. As far as the first petitioner/A2 is concerned, he has no previous case, this Court is of the firm view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the first petitioner/A2 on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the first petitioner/A2 alone 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.I, Arakkonam**, 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 conditions:

(a) If the first petitioner/A2 fails to surrender before the 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 first petitioner/A2 shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am for a period of two 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 first petitioner/A2 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the first petitioner/A2 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.



8. In the result, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed insofar as the first petitioner is concerned and dismissed insofar as the second petitioner is concerned.

10-04-2026

DRL

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Arakkonam.

2.The Inspector of Police,
ARAKKONAM TALUK POLICE STATION,
Ranipet District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9066 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

DRL

CRL OP No. 9066 of 2026

10-04-2026