



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12070 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-05-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 12070 of 2026

1. Arjun
2. Arunkumar

..Petitioners

Vs

The State Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
T-12, Poonamalle Police Station,
Chennai - 600 056.
(Cr.No.207 of 2026)

..Respondent

Prayer : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S, to enlarge the Petitioners on Anticipatory Bail in the event of the arrest by the respondent police in Cr.No.207 of 2026, pending on the file of respondent police.

For Petitioners: Mr.D.Prabu

For Respondent: Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners/accused, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, in connection with the Crime No.207 of 2026, seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that, during the course of a dispute arising out of a death procession, the defacto complainant intervened, whereupon the petitioners assaulted him and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed on the petitioners. He also submitted that the offences have been wrongly mentioned as 323, 324 and 506(2) of IPC and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002 instead of Sections 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners by reiterating the prosecution case. However, he would submit that no previous cases are pending against the petitioners. He further submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital.



5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

WEB COPY

6. Considering the rival submissions made on either side, the nature of the offences, the injured was discharged from the hospital, the fact that no previous cases are pending against the petitioners, and also the fact that the dispute arose between the parties during the course of the death procession, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following 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 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Poonamallee**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, **on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of four weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation.**

[b] the petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;



[c] the petitioners shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.2023.

13-05-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

LPP

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Poonammallee.

2.The Inspector of Police,
T-12, Poonamalle Police Station,
Chennai - 600 056.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12070 of 2



P.DHANABAL J.

LPP

CRL OP No. 12070 of 2026

13-05-2026