



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12874 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. 12874 of 2026

Vimal

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police
Manimangalam Police Station,
Tambaram District.
Crime No. 57/2026.

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS to enlarge the petitioner on bail in connection with Crime No.57 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.D.Padmanabhan

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Vinothraja,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner/A4, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 04.02.2026 for the offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 109(1), 351(3) of BNS corresponding to Sections 146, 147, 148, 294(b), 307, 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.57 of 2026 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks bail.



2.The case of the prosecution is that, while the *de facto* complainant was consuming alcohol with his friend, a dispute arose when a piece of food accidentally fell on the petitioner and the other accused persons. Due to prior enmity between the petitioner and the *de facto* complainant and the other accused persons, the petitioner attacked the *de facto* complainant causing grievous injuries, due to which, he was admitted in the hospital. Hence, the case.

3.Learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there existed previous enmity between the *de facto* complainant and the accused persons. The alleged occurrence took place in a local bar while consuming alcohol, during the course of which, a quarrel ensued between the parties and they exchanged heated words. He would further submit that the *de facto* complainant attacked the accused persons which led to a scuffle. He would further submit that the *de facto* complainant is also a habitual offender and is involved in several criminal cases. The learned counsel would further submit that the petitioner was not even present at the scene of occurrence and he has been falsely implicated in this case only on the ground that the co-accused is a friend of the petitioner. He would further submit that the injured has now been discharged from the hospital and the petitioner is in incarceration for more than three months. He would further submit that, though there are 7 previous cases



pending against the petitioner which are all similar in nature, in all the cases, bail was granted to the petitioner, and hence, he prays for grant of bail.

WEB COPY

4. *Per contra*, Mr.R.Vinothraja, learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent Police, would submit that the petitioner has caused brutal attack causing grievous injuries. He would further submit that the petitioner is a habitual offender and there are 7 previous cases of similar nature pending against him. He would further submit that the investigation has been completed and charge sheet has also been laid in the case. Hence, he opposes for grant of bail.

5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the entire materials on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions and the nature of offence and also considering the fact that the injured is now discharged from the hospital and also considering the fact that, though there are 7 previous cases pending against the petitioner, which are also of similar nature, in all the cases, bail has been granted to him, and also having regard to the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner for more than three months, I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to the certain conditions:



7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing 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 Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur at Kancheepuram District, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the learned Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur at Kancheepuram District, on all working days at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he is suspected;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioner 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 him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner 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].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under

Section 229A IPC.

14-05-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MKN

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 Judicial Magistrate,
Sriperumbudur at
Kancheepuram District
2. The Inspector of Police
Manimangalam Police Station,
Tambaram District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.
4. The Superintendent,
Central Prison-II,
Puzhal.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12874 of 2



P.DHANABAL J.

MKN

CRL OP No. 12874 of 2026

14-05-2026