



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9226 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 15-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 9226 of 2026

1. Pachamuthu
S/o.Ramachandran,
No.9781, West Street,
Perperiyankuppam Post,
Muthandikuppam,
Cuddalore District-607805.
2. Jayaraj
S/o.Arumugam,
No.977/4, West Street,
Perperiyankuppam Post,
Muthandikuppam,
Cuddalore District-607805.
3. Vairamani
W/o.Pachamuthu,
No.9781, West Street,
Perperiyankuppam Post,
Muthandikuppam,
Cuddalore District-607805.
4. Rajendhri
W/o.Mayakrishnan,
No.203, Indira Gandhi Salai,
Manadikuppam, Vallam Post,
Cuddalore District – 607805.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State rep.by, The Station House Officer,
Muthandikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
Cr.No.55 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)



PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners/accused (A-1 to 4) on bail in the event of their arrest in connection with the Cr.No.55 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. Gandhi Kumar Kalyanasundram

For Respondent(s): MR.P.DHILEEPAN GOVT.ADVOCATE (CRL SIDE)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS Act r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman (Amendment) Act, 2002 in Crime No.55 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the defacto complainant was involved in an illicit relationship with the husband of the fourth petitioner. In this connection, the petitioners went to the residence of the defacto complainant and reprimanded him, during which an altercation ensued, leading to the present occurrence. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case and that



they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that the occurrence took place on 29.03.2026 and FIR was registered on 02.04.2026. He further submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side.

6. Considering the totality of the circumstances and the fact that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and that the FIR was registered on 02.04.2026, at this length of time, this Court is of the firm view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on 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 is made ready, before the **learned Judicial**



Magistrate No.1, Panruti, 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 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 petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am and 5.30 pm for a period of 15 days 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.

15-04-2026

DRL



To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Panruti.

2.The Station House Officer,
Muthandikuppam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
Cr.No.55 of 2026.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9226 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

DRL

CRL OP No. 9226 of 2026

15-04-2026