



CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Date : 30.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

- 1.Uthiraselvan
- 2.Sri Murugan
- 3.Kani Rasa
- 4.Chinnatambi
- 5.Bala Prakash
- 6.Selvaraj R
- 7.Mariyammal
- 8.Chellappa R
- 9.Kalaiselvi
- 10.Mari
- 11.Sumithra
- 12.Kulalamani K
- 13.Kottaisamy Chellappa
- 14.Thenammal
- 15.Marimuthu @ Papathi
- 16.Thirumalaikolundu
- 17.S.Poothai
- 18.Mari Selvi
- 19.Selvan

...Petitioners/Accused

Vs



CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Pavoorchatram Police Station  
Tenkasi  
(Crime No. 109 of 2026 )

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Vishnuvardhan  
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. 109 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 the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 324(4), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No. 109 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to civil dispute, on 25.02.2026 at about 3.00 p.m., the petitioners illegally trespassed into the



CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

property and threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences.

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. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that there is a civil dispute between the parties and counter case is also registered. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b), 324(4), 351(3) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 and Section 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No. 109 of 2026. He would further submit that nobody was injured in this case and counter case is also registered as against the defacto complainant. He would further submit that the petitioners have no previous case. He would further submit that the



CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

6. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, and considering the facts that nobody was injured in this case and counter case is also registered as against the defacto complainant and also the petitioners have no previous case, 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) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Tenkasi, and on further conditions that:

**[b] the petitioners shall report before the**



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

**respondent police, on 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.

[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.

7. At this stage, the learned counsel for the petitioners would



CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026

submit that since the petitioners are relatives, common sureties may be allowed.

8. Insofar as common sureties are concerned, it is for the Magistrate to decide. Hence, if any request made by the petitioners in respect of common sureties, the same can be considered by the learned Judicial Magistrate, Tenkasi in accordance with law.

(P D B J)  
30.04.2026

apd

To

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



WEB COPY



**CRL OP(MD). No. 8765 of 2026**

**P. DHANABAL, J**

apd

ORDER  
IN  
**CRL OP(MD) No. 8765 of 2026**

Date : 30.04.2026