



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 12.03.2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE JUSTICE MR. K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

CRL OP(MD). No.5090 of 2026

1.Subramaniyan

2.Saravanan

... Petitioner/Accused No.4&5

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep.,By,
The Inspector of Police,
Musiri Police Station,
Trichy District.
Crime No.87 of 2026.

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.AS.Joel Paul Antony

For Respondent : Mr.M.Karunanithi,
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.87 of 2026 on the file of the
respondent police.

1/8



ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women (Amendment) Act, 2002, in Crime No.87 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner is the sister-in-law's husband of the defacto complainant and the second petitioner is the close relative of the first petitioner. On 10.02.2026, at about 09.00 a.m., a dispute arose in connection with the cancellation of a settlement deed and also regarding the maintenance proceedings pending before the Revenue Divisional Officer under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007. Pending the same, the petitioners and the other accused are alleged to have trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted her. Therefore, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police, pursuant to which, the respondent police registered a case in Crime No.



87 of 2026 for the aforesaid alleged offences.

WEB COPY

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that, prior to the occurrence, maintenance was granted in favour of the A1 on 27.01.2026 by directing the defacto complainant to pay a sum of Rs.3,000/- to A1. He would further submit that, in respect of the cancellation of the settlement deed, an enquiry is pending. Insofar as the occurrence is concerned, it is the defacto complainant who allegedly assaulted A1 and, therefore, A1 lodged a complaint before the respondent police, which was also registered in Crime No.88 of 2026. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the injured persons have been discharged from the hospital. However, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. This Court considered the rival submission made by the learned



WEB COPY

counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

6. From a reading of the complaint and the materials placed before this Court, it appears that the dispute between the parties has arisen among family members. The narration in the complaint indicates that differences had arisen between them on several occasions and that, at earlier points of time, attempts were made by the parties, with the intervention of elders and well-wishers, to resolve the dispute amicably. It is further brought to the notice of this Court that the first petitioner had filed a petition before the Revenue Divisional Officer under the Maintenance and Welfare of Parents and Senior Citizens Act, 2007 and the same was ordered on 27.01.2026, directing payment of a sum of Rs.3,000/- per month towards maintenance. Having regard to the overall circumstances of the case, the nature of the allegations and the fact that the dispute essentially emanates from among family members, this Court is of the view that the petitioners can be granted the relief of anticipatory bail, subject to appropriate conditions, so as to ensure their cooperation



WEB COPY

with the investigation. Since all the petitioners are close family members, common surety is permitted for them.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a ***common surity*** for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each, with two sureties each for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the ***learned Judicial Magistrate, Musiri, Trichy District***, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order and on further conditions that:

[a] ***the learned Judicial Magistrate, Musiri, Trichy District, is hereby directed to accept the common surity.***

[b] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity.

[c] ***the petitioners shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.***

[d] the petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence or witness



either during investigation or trial.

WEB COPY

[e]the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[f]On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned 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 is 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 269 of BNS.

12.03.2026

dss



WEB COPY



To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Musiri,
Trichy District.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Musiri Police Station,
Trichy District.
3. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J.,

dss

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.5090 of 2026**

Date : 12.03.2026