



CRL OP(MD). No.9121 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 06.05.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD). No.9121 of 2026

1.Palpandi,
S/o.Kannaiah Devar

2.Subbaiah,
S/o.Muthudaiya Devar

... Petitioners/A3 & A2

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu
Rep.By, the Inspector of Police,
Nanguneri Police Station,
Tirunelveli District.
(Crime No.212 of 2026)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Susikumar,
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar,
Additional Public Prosecutor

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

1/7



CRL OP(MD), No.9121 of 2026

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.212 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A3 & A2, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 329(4), and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, read with Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, in Crime No.212 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that Chelladurai, a relative of the petitioner, was involved in an offence under the POCSO Act, as he allegedly misbehaved with the elder daughter of the de-facto complainant. In connection with the said offence, he was arrested, remanded to judicial custody, and subsequently released on bail. He is presently facing trial before the POCSO Court, Tirunelveli.

3. While so, on 15.04.2026, at about 9.20 p.m., the petitioners, along with two other accused persons, allegedly trespassed into the house of the de-facto complainant and threatened him and his daughter not to



CRL OP(MD), No.9121 of 2026

depose against Chelladurai. When the de-facto complainant refused, the petitioners are alleged to have abused him and his daughter and further threatened them with dire consequences. Hence, the present case.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and have not committed any offences as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready and willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police submitted that the petitioners, who are relatives of one Chelladurai involved in an offence under the POCSO Act, threatened the witnesses, namely the de-facto complainant and his daughter, not to depose in the said case. He further submitted that the 1st petitioner (A3) has no previous cases registered against him, whereas the 2nd petitioner (A2) has 18 previous cases registered against him. Hence, he opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also the fact that there are no previous cases registered against the 1st petitioner (A3) and there are 18 previous cases registered against the 2nd petitioner (A2), this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, on condition that the petitioners shall 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 Judicial Magistrate, Nanguneri, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy was made ready and on further conditions that:

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity;



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.9121 of 2026

[b] the 1st petitioner (A3) shall report before the trial Court monthly once, i.e. on 1st working day of every month at 10.30 am., until further orders. The 2nd petitioner (A2) shall report before the Inspector of Police, Cantonment Police Station, Trichy District, daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

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

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

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned 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 is released on bail by the learned



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.9121 of 2026

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].

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR
can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

(S S Y J)
06.05.2026

mkn

To

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

Copy to

The Inspector of Police,

6/7



WEB COPY

Cantonment Police Station,
Trichy District.



CRL OP(MD). No.9121 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

mkn

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD). No.9121 of 2026**

06.05.2026