



CRL OP(MD). No. 5821 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 30.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 5821 of 2026

Vijayarajan

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Panagudi Police Station,
Panagudi,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No. 321 of 2026)

...Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Jeevin
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.S.Muthumalai Raja

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 321 of 2026 on the file of the
respondent police.

1/5



CRL OP(MD). No. 5821 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No. 321 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 07.03.2026, when the defacto complainant and his wife proceeded to their agricultural work, the petitioner intercepted them, threatened and abused them with filthy language and also cause cut injuries to the defacto complainant with aruval. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected in the above said incident. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No. 5821 of 2026

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) fairly submits that due to the civil dispute, the occurrence happened and the injured was discharged from the hospital and however, the injured lost his eye sight. He further submits that the investigation is in initial stage. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4A. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor also reiterated the arguments of the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) and opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and also considering the facts that according to the prosecution, the defacto complainant lost his eye sight and investigation is also in initial stage, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 5821 of 2026

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

apd

(P D B J)
30.03.2026
(2/2)

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Panagudi Police Station,
Panagudi,
Tirunelveli District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 5821 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 5821 of 2026

Date : 30.03.2026
(2/2)