

CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 08/06/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

1. Vaiyapuri

2. Ananthi

... Petitioners/ Accused

Rank Not Known

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep. By,  
The Inspector of Police,  
Vaiyampatty Police Station,  
Tiruchirappalli District.  
Crime No.242 of 2026.

... Respondent/ Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.242 of 2026 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioners : T.A. Ebenezer,  
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the




CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2) and 118(1) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.242 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner and the defacto complainant are the brothers and the second petitioner is the wife of the first petitioner. Due to property dispute, on 02.06.2026, at about 08.00 am, the petitioners trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and tried to paint the house. When the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, they abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and attacked him with an aruval and threatened him 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. He would further submit that the property is the ancestral property and the petitioners tried to renovate the same and in the alleged occurrence, both the parties sustained injury and on the complaint lodged by the second petitioner,




CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

the respondent police has not taken any action and the injured was discharged from the hospital and no previous case 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 though the petition has filed in crime number not known stage, now FIR has been registered in Crime No.242 of 2026 for the offences under Sections 296(b), 115(2) and 118(1) of BNS, 2023. Due to property dispute, the petitioners abused and attacked the defacto complainant with an aruval and threatened him with dire consequences and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. He would further submit that the injured was discharged from the hospital and no previous case is pending against the petitioners.

5. 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 property dispute between the parties and considering the relationship between the



CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

parties and already a complaint was lodged by the second petitioner against the defacto complainant and the injured was discharged from the hospital and no previous case 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 bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrat, Manapparai**, 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 learned Judicial Magistrate concerned 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 4 weeks, and thereafter as and when required for the interrogation.

[c] the petitioners shall not commit any offences of



CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

similar nature.

WEB COPY

[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)  
08.06.2026

dss



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.10374 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

dss

To.

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Manapparai.

2.The Inspector of Police,  
Vaiyampatty Police Station, Tiruchirappalli District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER  
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.10374 of 2026

Date : 08/06/2026