



CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 11/06/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

1. Bhavani

2. Rajkumar

... Petitioners/ Accused No.2 & 3

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Dindigul.
(Crime No. 18 of 2026).

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 18 of 2026 on the file of the
Respondent Police.

For Petitioners : Poornachandran.S,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar,
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.10765 of 2026

respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 316(1), 318(3), 316(5) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.18 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is an Advocate. He owned a property to an extent of 99 cents at TS.No.11, Block-8, Ward 'C', Kodaikanal Town, Dindigul District. On 18.09.1995, he gifted 20 cents to one Kathiresan. Similarly on 21.10.1993, he gifted 32 cents to one Mary Josephine and he was in possession and enjoyment of the remaining 47 cents. In the month of 2025, after the demise of the said Kathiresan, his legal heirs approached the defacto complainant for selling their property along with the adjacent land holder Mary Josephine. Through one Vaigaithurai, one Helen Preethan David and Andrew Preethan David intended to purchase the said property and sale consideration was fixed as Rs.2.5 lakhs per cent. Subsequently, the sale has been executed on 11.12.2025 and the defacto complainant received Rs.1.5 lakh per cent and the balance sale consideration has been deposited in the A1's account through demand draft on his promise that he would repay the same after getting loan for his business development.



CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

On 18.12.2025 at about 04.00 p.m, when the defacto complainant along with Vaigaithurai and Sagaya Jeyaseelan went to the house of A1 and demanded the balance amount, the accused persons abused them in filthy language and criminally intimidated them. 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 originally, the property at TS.No.11, Block-8, Ward 'C', Kodaikanal Town, Dindigul District, 20 cents of land was stands in the name of A1's father and one Vaigaithurai approached A1 as he is the one of the land owner situated at at TS.No.11, Block-8, Ward 'C', Kodaikanal Town, Dindigul District. Due to financial constrained, A1 consent to purchase the property and also received the sale consideration through demand draft. He would further submit that even as per prosecution, the entire amount was transferred to the account of A1 and the entire allegation is against A1 only and no previous case is pending against the petitioners. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that there is a land dispute between the parties and the offence committed by the accused is grave in nature and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. He would further submit that 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 dispute between the parties in respect of sale of property and even according to the prosecution, the defacto complainant already executed a sale deed but not received the sale consideration and hence, it is a case of civil dispute and the entire allegation is only against A1 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



CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

WEB COPY

order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate-II, Dindigul**, 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 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



CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

WEB COPY

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)
11.06.2026

dss

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-II, Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Dindigul.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.10765 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

dss

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10765 of 2026

Date : 11/06/2026