



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 9171 of 2026

1. Kuppayi
W/o. Seenivasan,
Nachanur Kaattuvalavu,
Koranampatti Post,
Konganapuram. Idappadi Taluk,
Salem District.
2. Jagadeeswari
W/o.Chithuraj, .
No.3/332, Sanjeeviyur,
Mettur,
Surappalli,
Jalakantapuram,
Salem 636 501.
3. S Venkatesan
S/o. Seenivasan,
No.2/327, Nachanur,
Koranampatti Post,
Edappadi Taluk
Salem District.
4. Ramachandiran
S/o. Seenivasan,
Door.No. 13/100,
Koranampatti Post,
Edappadi Taluk
Salem District.
5. Gowtham
(Gowdhami as per Aadhar card),
W/o. Venkatesan,
No.2/331, Koranampatti,
Edappadi Taluk,
Salem District.



..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep.by its, The Inspector of Police,
Konganapuram Police Station,
(Crime No. 64 of 2026).

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to grant an Anticipatory Bail to this Petitioners in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before any court in connection with the case in Crime No.64 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the Respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. A Arun

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), 118(1) & 74 of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.64 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that due to a land dispute, an altercation arose between the petitioners and the defacto complainant, during which, the petitioners are alleged to have assaulted the defacto complainant with wooden log, thereby causing injuries to her. Hence, the complaint.



3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the occurrence took place on 14.03.2026 and the FIR was registered on 15.03.2026.

He further submitted that the first, second and fifth petitioners are women and that all the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions, submitted that the injured was under treatment in the hospital for 16 days and had sustained fractures. 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 and also perused the records available

6. Taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances and the fact that the petitioners 3 and 4 are concerned, though the defacto complainant was discharged from the hospital because of the injury caused by these petitioners constrained her in the hospital for 16 days. Hence enlarging the petitioners on anticipatory bail at this stage would affect the moral fiber of society at large. In



such view of the position, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the petitioners 3 and 4 on anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

7. As far as the petitioners 1, 2 and 5, it is seen that they are women, the injured has been discharged from the hospital and there are no specific overt acts against them, this Court is of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners 1, 2 and 5 on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners 1, 2 and 5 are alone 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 Additional District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Court, Edappadi**, 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 1, 2 and 5 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 1, 2 and 5 shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 am for a period of 30 days and thereafter as and when required;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioners 1, 2 and 5 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 1, 2 & 5 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 1, 2 and 5 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 petitioners 1, 2 and 5 are concerned and dismissed insofar as the petitioners 3 and 4 are concerned.

10-04-2026

DRL

To

1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Court,
Edappadi.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Konganapuram Police Station,

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9171 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

DRL

CRL OP No. 9171 of 2026

10-04-2026