



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 17.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

Vijayakumar

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station
Trichy.
(Crime No. 172 of 2026)

...Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.Mohammed Abdul Rasiq
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.D.Pandiyaraj

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 172 of 2026 on the file of the
respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 191(2), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 @ 191(2), 329(3), 296(b), 115(2), 351(2), 324(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 4 of the TNPWH Act, in Crime No. 172 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 24.04.2026, the petitioner along with the other accused trespassed into the premises, wherein the defacto complainant was working as Manager of a hotel, used abusive language, threatened the employees and damaged the building, arch, advertisement board, worth about Rs.15,00,000/-. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit 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. He would further submit that the petitioner is the owner of the property and there is a lease agreement entered between the parties. He would further submit that co-accused



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

was granted bail. Hence, he prayed to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the petitioner is the owner of the property, in which the defacto complainant entered into a lease agreement for parking vehicle and also invested huge amount of money, but the petitioner has damaged the properties. Hence, he stongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Counsel for State of TN (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) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 @ 191(2), 329(3), 296(b), 115(2), 351(2), 324(5) of BNS, 2023 and Section 4 of the TNPWH Act, in Crime No. 172 of 2026. He would further submit that the petitioner has no previous case. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026


WEB COPY

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and considering the facts that there is a tenancy dispute between the parties, and though the alleged occurrence took place on 24.04.2026, FIR has been registered only on 29.04.2026 and co-accused was granted bail and also the petitioner has no previous 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/her appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate-V, Trichy, on condition that the 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 Judicial Magistrate concerned and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

WEB COPY

police, daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of thirty days, and thereafter as and when required for the 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 registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

(P D B J)
17.06.2026

apd

5/7



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-V, Trichy.
 - 2.The Inspector of Police,
Samayapuram Police Station
Trichy.
 - 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 11421 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 11421 of 2026

Date : 17.06.2026
(2/2)