



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-05-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

Crl. O.P. No.12510 of 2026

1. G.Ravindiran
S/o.Govindhan,

2. G.Parvathi
W/o.Govindhan,

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Thirupalapandhal Police Station
Kallakurichi District.
(Crime No.34 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 the Crime No.34 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.B.Pachaiyappan

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 296(b), 115(2), 74, 118(1), 324(2) and 351(3) of BNSS, 2023/ Sections 294(b), 323, 354, 324, 425 and 506(ii) of Indian Penal Code, 1860, in connection with Crime No.34 of 2026, seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that there was a longstanding land dispute between the families of the petitioner and that of the defacto complainant. While so, on 22.02.2026, at approximately 8.00 a.m., the 1st petitioner was in an intoxicated state and he abused the defacto complainant in a filthy language and assaulted her with his hands. When the defacto complainant's husband intervened, the 2nd petitioner had attacked the defacto complainant on his chest and abused him in a filthy language. The 3rd accused/minor has attacked the de-facto complainant with a broomstick. Hence the case. It was further stated that the 1st petitioner attempted to attack the defacto complainant's husband with a knife, however, he had escaped from the attack. Due to which, the defacto complainant and her husband ran into their house and stayed inside, however, the petitioners have jointly damaged the door. When the defacto complainant and her husband were travelling to the hospital, the 1st petitioner and other unidentified persons have intercepted them and threatened them with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that petitioners are innocent persons and have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submits that there has been a longstanding property dispute between the families of the petitioners and that of the defacto complainant. Owing to the same and out of personal animosity, the defacto complainant had lodged the complaint against the petitioners with a malafide



intention to harass and intimidate them. 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 the petitioners are having no previous case. He further submitted that the injured was treated as out patient in the hospital. Hence, he 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, the nature of offences and in view of the fact that injured has been treated as out patient and there are no previous cases as against the petitioners, 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 at Tirukovilur** on condition that the petitioners shall execute a



separate bond 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.

To:

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate,
Tirukovilur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Thirupalapandhal Police Station
Kallakurichi District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court,
Chennai.



WEB COPY

Crl. OP. No.12510 of 2



P.DHANABAL J.

MKA/SHA

CRL OP No.12510 of 2026

13-05-2026