



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.34414 of 2025

1.Manimegalai
2.Vinothkumar
3.Ravichandran
4.Nalina @ Naveena
5.Umadevi
6.Anbarasan

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep
The Inspector of Police,
Bagalur Police Station,
Krishnagiri District,
(Crime No.306 of 2025)

.. Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.306 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Sarathkumar

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervener : Mr.M.Varunkumar

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 334(2), 296(b) & 351(2) of



BNS Act 2023 r/w Section 3 of TNPDDL in Crime No.306 of 2025 registered on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they joined hands with the other accused, conspired together, trespassed into the property of the de facto complainant, and caused damage to the property to the tune of about Rs.50,000/-, pursuant to which a complaint was lodged.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are arrayed as A1 to A5 & A7 in the present case and all are falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the occurrence took place in the month of March 2025 and the complaint was belatedly lodged on 08.10.2025. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the intervener appeared and submitted that the intervener had intentionally filed the intervening petition and raised objections. However, despite seeking adjournments on two earlier occasions, no objection petition has been filed so far, and even today, further time was sought to file objections opposing the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the alleged occurrence had taken place about seven months prior to the registration of



the FIR. He further submitted that the prosecution was unable to assess the actual damage caused to the property. According to the prosecution, the allegation is that due to a property dispute, the petitioners entered into the premises of the de facto complainant and damaged the property, resulting in the lodging of the complaint. He further submitted that the petitioners have no previous criminal cases pending against them. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the nature of the allegations and the fact that the petitioners are not having any previous cases pending against them and the occurrence took place in the month of March 2025 and reported only in the month of October 2025, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners are directed to deposit a sum of Rs.7,500/- (Rupees Seven Thousand Five Hundred only) each to the credit of Crime Number 306 of 2025 and on such deposit and on receipt of proof of payment, 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 No.I, Hosur, Krishnagiri District* on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), each with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, every day at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(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]; and;

WEB COPY



(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR

WEB COPY can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

06.01.2026

drl

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Hosur, Krishnagiri District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
Bagalur Police Station,
Krishnagiri District,

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl

CRL.O.P.No.34414 of 2025

(2/2)



WEB COPY



06.01.2026