



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 01-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 13306 of 2026

1. Syed Farhan
2. Sheik Abdul Rahman
3. Syed Yasir @ Syed Yasin
4. Syed Rizwan

..Petitioners

Vs

The State Represented by,
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thiruvannamalai Town Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.
Crime No.105 of 2026.

..Respondent


PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in Crime No. 105 of 2026, on the file of Sub-Inspector of Police, Thiruvannamalai Town Police Station, Thiruvannamalai District.

For Petitioners: Mr.S.Silambuselvan

For Respondent: Mr.N.Palanivel
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 10.04.2026 for the alleged offences under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 115(2), 118(1), 109 and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No.105 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's daughter had married the first petitioner through a love marriage. Subsequently, misunderstandings arose between them and they separated and the dispute is stated to be pending before the Muslim Jamath. On 07.04.2026, when the first petitioner burst crackers in the street, the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, which resulted in a wordy quarrel. During the altercation, the first petitioner blamed the defacto complainant for the breakdown of his matrimonial life. It is alleged that A2 assaulted the defacto complainant with a wooden log, A1 assaulted him by hands, A2 kicked him on the chest and A4 and A5 pulled him down and assaulted him. When the defacto complainant's brother-in-law intervened, he was also allegedly assaulted. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that there are five accused in this case and the present petitioners are arrayed as A1, A3, A4 and A5, while A3 is a juvenile. The learned counsel would further submit that the dispute arose out of matrimonial issues between the daughter of the defacto complainant and A1 and that the occurrence took place in the course of a wordy altercation. It is further submitted that the petitioners have been in incarceration since 10.04.2026. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail to the petitioners.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the petitioners were involved in the occurrence and assaulted the defacto complainant and another injured person. However, he fairly submitted that the injured had been discharged from the hospital on 19.05.2026.

5. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side.

6. From the submission of the learned counsel on either side, this Court is of the view that the occurrence appears to have arisen out of a matrimonial dispute between the family members. Taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances, the nature of the allegations, the fact that the injured has already been discharged from the hospital on 19.05.2026 and further considering that the petitioners have been in incarceration since 10.04.2026, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on bail, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty-Five Thousand only), with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvannamalai**, and subject to the following conditions:



WEB COPY



[a] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the Application for Surety ship [Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[b] the petitioners are directed to stay at Coimbatore District and report before the Inspector of Police, E1 Singanallur Police Station, Coimbatore daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of 30 days and thereafter report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation;

[c] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;


[d] the petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

[e] on breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions had been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court itself, as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)13 SCC 283]*;

[f] if the petitioners thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR may be registered under Section 269 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023.

01-06-2026

NSL



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 learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Thiruvannamalai.
2. Central Prison, Vellore.
3. The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thiruvannamalai Town Police Station,
Thiruvannamalai District.
4. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 13306 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

NSL

CRL OP No. 13306 of 2026

01-06-2026