



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14-05-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 12443 of 2026

1. B.Rathi
W/o. Baskar,
No. 14/15, Begum 5th Street,
Royapettah, Chennai-600014.
2. Baskar
S/o. Sabapathi,
No. 14/15, Begum 5th Street,
Royapettah, Chennai-600014.
3. Surya,
S/o. Baskar,
No. 14/15, Begum 5th Street,
Royapettah, Chennai-600014.
4. Gandhi
S/o. Sabapathi,
No. 14/15, Begum 5th Street,
Royapettah, Chennai-600014.
5. Dhanush
S/o.Raji,
No. 12, Kuppusamy Street,
Ambedkar Nagar,
Royapettah, Chennai-600014.
6. Vasudevan
S/o. Jagannathan,
No. 13, 2nd Street, Nadukuppam Triplicane,
Chennai-600005.
7. Gowtham
S/o. Chandran,
No. 23, Kuppusamy Street,
Dr. Ambedkar Street,
Royapettah, Chennai-600014.

WEB COPY



8. Vikki @ Vignesh
12, Kuppusamy Street,
Dr.Ambedkar Street,
Royapettah, Chennai.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep by The Inspector of Police,
E-2 Royapettah Police Station,
Chennai-600014.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer:

Criminal Original Petition filed under 482 of the BNSS, to enlarge the petitioners in the event of arrest on anticipatory bail pending investigation in Crime No. 81 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent police and pass such further or other orders as this Honble Court .

For Petitioner(s): Mr.G.Mohana Krishnan

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Balaji, GA (Crl.side)

ORDER

The petitioners / Accused, who apprehend arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 296(b), 115(2), 329(4), 351(3) of BNS & 4 of TNPHW, in connection with the Cr. No.81 of 2026, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners, being the members of a political party, viz., Tamilaga Vetri Kazhagam, had criminally intimidated the defacto complainant and other party members and compelled them to



remove the tables and chairs put up in connection with election work. Further, they used unparliamentary words against the complainant and also attacked the Joint Secretary of DMK Party. Therefore, a complaint was lodged against the petitioners before the respondent-police. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioners are innocent and the above complaint was falsely lodged by the complainant. Further, he would submit that the very complaint was filed as a counter complaint to the petitioners' earlier complaint, which was filed before the D3 Ice House Police Station. He would also submit that the petitioners have no previous case. Hence, the petitioners may be released on anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that based on the complaint received from the complainant, they registered the case in Cr. No.81 of 2026 against the petitioners for the offence under Section Section 296(b), 115(2), 329(4), 351(3) of BNS & 4 of TNPHW and the case is under investigation. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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



6. Considering the rival submissions on either side, considering the nature of offences, it appears that the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant is a counter complaint to the earlier complaint filed by the petitioners. Further, the dispute between the parties is only due to the Tamil Nadu Legislative Assembly election work. Therefore, considering the fact that there is no previous case pending against these petitioners, 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 **XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate, Saidapet, Chennai**, on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute a 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 every Saturday for a period of 4 weeks and thereafter as and when required;

[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 her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer;

[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.

14-05-2026

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

Note:

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.
2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.

To:

1.The XVIII Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet, Chennai

2. The Inspector of Police
E-2 Royapettah Police Station,
Chennai – 600 014

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12443 of 2



P.DHANABAL J.

nsa/rst

CRL OP No. 12443 of 2026

14-05-2026