



CRL OP(MD). No.8058 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 27/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.8058 of 2026

1. Murugesan

2. Ganapathy

3. Subbaiah

4. Vinoth

5. Poomalai

... Petitioners/ Accused No.1 to 5

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Keelavalavu Police Station,
Madurai District.

In Crime No. 96 of 2026.

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 96 of 2026 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioners : A. Jeyaram,
Advocate.

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

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD), No.8058 of 2026

WEB COPY

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 191(3), 329(4), 133, 115(5), 118(1) & 351(3) of BNS, 2023 r/w Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, (Corresponding Sections 147, 148, 448, 323, 324 & 506(2) of IPC r/w Section 4 of TN Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002), in Crime No.96 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that 12.04.2026 at about 07.00 a.m, due to the dispute with regard to form stage to conduct Valli Tirumana Drama in order to temple festival, the petitioners and other accused are said to have trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant, who is administrating the accounts of the village, and dragged her out of her house by holding her hair and beat her with broomstick and knife and caused injuries. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and



CRL OP(MD), No.8058 of 2026

they are no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that it is a case and case in counter and the injured was discharged from the hospital and no previous cases is pending against the petitioners. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that due to the dispute in conducting drama during the temple festival, the petitioners and the other accused attacked the defacto complainant and caused injuries and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. He would further submit that it is a case and case in counter and the injured was discharge from the hospital and the petitioners have no previous case.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the second petitioner/A2 was arrested by the respondent police and the same was affirmed by the learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side).

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



CRL OP(MD), No.8058 of 2026

7. Since the second petitioner/A2 was arrested by the respondent police, this petition is dismissed as against the second petitioner/A2 is concerned.

8. As far as the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 are concerned, considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, and there is a dispute between the parties with respect to conducting temple festival and it is a case and case in counter and counter case has been registered against the defacto complainant and the injured was discharged from the hospital and no previous cases is pending against the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 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, Melur, Madurai**, and on further conditions that:



CRL OP(MD), No.8058 of 2026

WEB COPY

[b] the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 shall report before the respondent police, every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of four weeks, and thereafter as and when required for the interrogation.

[c] the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 s 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 1 & 3 to 5 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 1 & 3 to 5 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 B.N.S.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.8058 of 2026

(P D B J)
27.04.2026

dss

To

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.8058 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

DSS

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.8058 of 2026

Date : 27/04/2026