



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12529 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 14-05-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL**

**CRL OP No. 12529 of 2026**

1. Akash J  
Son of Janakiraman,  
1 174 Sengeniyanman Kovil Street,  
Uthandi, Chennai 600119.
2. Gokul  
Son of Sundaresan,  
1/152C Bajanai Koil Street,  
Uthandi, Chennai 600119.
3. Saranraj,  
S/o. Kumar,  
1/270 Kadumpadi Nayakkar Street,  
Karapakkam, Chennai 600097.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep. by, The Inspector of Police  
Neelangarai Police Station,  
Chennai District.  
Crime No.93 of 2026

..Respondent(s)

**Prayer:**

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNS, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest for the alleged offences u/s 296(b), 342(2), 115(2), 118(1) 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No. 93 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, pending investigation and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.M.I.Javid Akbar

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), 342(2), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS, in connection with the Cr. No.93 of 2026, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 06.03.2026, at around 4.30 pm, the petitioners, who had visited TASMACH at their locality, had created a problem with service man and employee as there had been a delay in serving the food. Subsequently, the petitioners had abused the employees at the TASMACH Shop and assaulted them. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would contend that the petitioners are no way connected with the above offence. The TASMACH employees had demanded high rates for the foods served at the shop and when the said act of the employees was questioned by the petitioners, it led to a wordy quarrel. However, the complainant had falsely lodged the complaint before the respondent-police. 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 this is the 3<sup>rd</sup> anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioners. Further, he would submit that based on the complaint received from the complainant, they registered the case in Cr. No.93 of 2026 against the petitioners for the offence under Section 296(b), 115(2), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS and the case is under investigation. He would also submit that the injured was already discharged from the hospital. 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 and also considering the fact that the injured was already discharged from the hospital and 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 **District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate, Sholinganallur**, 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 petitioner 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.

WEB COPY

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 District Munsif-cum-Judicial Magistrate,  
Sholinganallur

2. The Inspector of Police  
Neelangarai Police Station,  
Chennai

3. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12529 of 2



**P.DHANABAL J.**

nsa/rst

**CRL OP No. 12529 of 2026**

**14-05-2026**