



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **06.01.2026**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.34426 of 2025

Nishant Ranka

... Petitioner

Versus

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

.. Respondent

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

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Vasanth

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

For Intervener : Mr.M.Varunkumar

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 334(2), 296(b), 351(2) of BNS and Section 3 of Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Damage & Loss) Act, 1992 in Crime No.306 of 2025 registered on the file of the



respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he 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 petitioner submitted that the petitioner is arrayed as A6 in the present case and that he was formerly the Managing Director of the de facto complainant company. He was relieved from the said post about six months prior to the alleged occurrence. He further submitted that a false allegation has been attributed to the petitioner to the effect that he instigated A1 to A5 to trespass into the premises and cause damage to the property of the de facto complainant. Hence, the learned counsel prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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 petitioner.

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 petitioner 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 petitioner has no previous criminal cases pending against him. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner 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 petitioner is not having any previous case 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 petitioner with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner is directed to deposit a sum of Rs.7,500/- (Rupees Seven Thousand Five Hundred only) to the credit of Crime Number 306 of 2025 and on such deposit and on receipt of proof of payment, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest



or on his 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*, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), 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 petitioner shall report before the respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

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

(d) the petitioner 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;



(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR
can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

WEB COPY

06.01.2026

drl

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,
Hosur.

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

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl

CRL.O.P.No.34426 of 2025

(1/2)

06.01.2026