



WEB COPY

Crl. OP. No.12504 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.12504 of 2026

1. P.Murugesan
(Mentioned as Thavasi Murugan in the FIR)
S/o.Punnaiyamoorthy
2. Kalaimani
(Mentioned as Thavasi Murugan Wife in the
FIR)
W/o.Murugesan

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State by
Inspector of Police,
Saibaba Colony Police Station,
Coimbatore.
(Crime No.192 of 2026)

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioners on bail, in the event of their arrest, in Crime No.192 of 2026, pending investigation on the file of the Respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.A.Arun

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Balaji
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of



Woman (Amendment) Act, 2002, in connection with Crime No.192 of 2026,
seek anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant and the first accused have prior enmity as the de-facto complainant alleged to have assaulted the first accused's daughter. On 03.04.2026, around 8.00 p.m, when the de-facto complainant along with his friend went to the shop of the first accused, to enquire about the aforesaid incident, there was a wordy quarrel between the second accused, first accused and the de-facto complainant. Thereafter, when the de-facto complainant's brother had come to the spot, he was beaten up by the 1st petitioner and other unknown persons and threatened with dire consequences. It is the further case of the prosecution that the 2nd petitioner also assaulted the defacto complainant and scolded him in a filthy language. Hence the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution. It is further submitted that this is the first anticipatory bail application before this Court, and there are no previous cases pending against the petitioners. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by the conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed anticipatory bail for the petitioners.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are seven accused persons in this case and A2 to A7 have been arrested and still in custody. He further submitted that the injured has been discharged from the hospital. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioners.

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

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, there was a wordy quarrel between the neighbours and that the injured has been discharged from the hospital and no previous case is pending against the petitioner, this Court is 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 learned **Judicial Magistrate, Additional Mahila Court at Coimbatore** on condition that the petitioners shall execute separate bonds each 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 10.00 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 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 BNSS, 2023.

13-05-2026

MKA/SHA

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.

WEB COPY

To:

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate,
Additional Mahila Court,
Coimbatore.
- 2.The Inspector of Police
Saibaba colony Police Station
Coimbatore.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

Crl. OP. No.12504 of 2



P.DHANABAL J.

MKA/SHA

CRL OP No.12504 of 2026

13-05-2026