



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.9485 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 03.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 9485 of 2026

Muthukumar

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Sathankulam Police Station,
Thoothukudi District.
(Crime No.268 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Sonu
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

For Intervenor : Mr.P.Praveen Kumar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 268 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 351(2) and 75 of BNS, in Crime No.268 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9485 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is working under the petitioner. While so, on 26.04.2026 at about 1.30 p.m., the petitioner asked the defacto complainant to clean the backside room. When she started the cleaning work, the petitioner came there, grabbed her hand, pressed her breast and bit her lips, threatened her and left the place. In this way prior to this incident the petitioner misbehaved with the defacto complainant twice. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected in the above said incident. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The defacto complainant is working as ticket booker in his travel agency. Where, she misappropriated the amount. When the same was questioned by him, she lodged the present complaint. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the offences are grave in nature. The petitioner misbehaved with the defacto complainant, who is working under him. No one sustained injury. The



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9485 of 2026

petitioner has no previous case. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor would submit that the petitioner run a travel agency, in which the defacto complainant is working as ticket booking agent, while so, during the working hours, the petitioner harassed the defacto complainant. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, the petitioner has no previous case and no injuries reported in this case and considering all other facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Sathankulam**, on condition that the



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.9485 of 2026

petitioner shall 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 Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

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

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

[e] the petitioner 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9485 of 2026

registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

WEB COPY

(P D B J)
03.06.2026

TM

To

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9485 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 9485 of 2026

Date : 03.06.2026