



CRL OP(MD). No.8250 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.8250 of 2026

1. Mainavathi

2. Siva @ Sivakumar

3. Nagajothi

4. Mayakkal ... Petitioners/ Accused No.1 to 4

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Rayappanpatti Police Station,
Theni District.

Crime No.186 of 2026 ... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.186 of 2026 on the file of the
Respondent Police.

For Petitioners : Mr.C. Susikumar,
Advocate.

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

For Intervener : Mr.D.Malai Chamy

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the



CRL OP(MD), No.8250 of 2026

respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 329(3), 296(b), 118(1) and 351(3) of BNS Act, 2023, in Crime No.186 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is a practicing Advocate before the Uthamapalayam Magistrate Court and legal advisor to Cumbum Pon Muthu Gas Agency. On 11.04.2026 at about 11.00 a.m, the defacto complainant was informed by the owner of the Pon Muthu Gas Agency that the petitioners quarreled with him in his agricultural field even after showing the injunction order granted in O.S.No.160 of 2021 by the District Munsif Court, Uthamapalayam. On hearing the same, the defacto complainant went to the scene of occurrence. At that time, the petitioners said to have abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him 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 they are no way connected in the above said incident. He would further



CRL OP(MD), No.8250 of 2026

submit that 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 there is a civil dispute between the petitioners and the owner of the the Pon Muthu Gas Agency and the defacto complainant herein is the legal advisor to the said Gas Agency. Hence, the petitioners said to have abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and assaulted him and caused injuries and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. He would further submit that the injured was discharge from the hospital and the petitioners have no previous case.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervener would submit that the there is a dispute between the petitioners and the defacto complainant, who is an legal advisor to the Pon Muthu Gas Agency and no civil case is pending between the defacto complainant and the petitioners and the offence is grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory



bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

6. 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, and there is a civil dispute between the parties and the injured was discharged from the hospital and no previous cases is pending against the petitioners, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[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, Uthamapalayam**, and on further conditions that:

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



CRL OP(MD), No.8250 of 2026

[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].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

(P D B J)
27.04.2026

dss



CRL OP(MD), No.8250 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

DSS

To

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

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.8250 of 2026

Date : 27/04/2026