



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7296 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 15.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 7296 of 2026

1.P.Durgaimuthu
2.P.Nambirajan
3.R.Sidamani
4.R.Sivakami

... Petitioners

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Moondradaippu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.106 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Karansingh
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.M.Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 106 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7296 of 2026

the offences punishable under Sections 126(1), 189(3), 296(b), 115(2) of BNS and Section 3 of TNPPDL Act, in Crime No.106 of 2026, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 15.03.2026 the accused persons unlawfully assembled, trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, abused the defacto complainant, her mother in law with filthy language, damaged the house hold articles worth Rs.90,000/- and attempted to set fire by releasing gas cylinder, attached them with hands and threatened with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Due to previous civil dispute, the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the offences are grave in nature. Due to previous dispute between the parties, the



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.7296 of 2026

accused persons trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, caused damages to the house hold articles, windows and doors worth about Rs.90,000/- and threatened them with dire consequences. They also attacked the defacto complainant and her mother in law. A4 has one previous case. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioners. Investigating is still pending.

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 petitioners, that there is property dispute between the parties, no previous case pending against the petitioners except A4, even as per the FIR, the accused are none other than the sister's sons and they damaged the T.V, cell phone, windows and bathroom doors, tube lights, electricity wires and iron pipe, as per the observation mahazar only two pin plugs and android phone are damaged, but no mentioning about T.V., window and bathroom doors, tube lights and other things, by this time most of witnesses might have been examined, and also considering all the facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.7296 of 2026

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on condition to execute a bond 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, Shencottah** and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police at 10.30 a.m., on every Saturday for a period of four weeks, thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[c] the petitioners shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

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

[e] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial 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].



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7296 of 2026

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be

registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

(P D B J)
15.04.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Shencottah.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Moondradaippu Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.106 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7296 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 7296 of 2026

Date : 15.04.2026