



CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 12/06/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

Sarvesh

... Petitioner/ Accused No.1

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
Nachiyarkovil Police Station,
Thanjavur District.
(Crime No. 330 of 2026).

... Respondent/ Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Crime No. 330 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police...

For Petitioner : K. M.Karunakaran,
Advocate.

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

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to



CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

judicial custody on 30.04.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 49, 329(4), 296(b), 109(1), 351(3) of BNS, 2023 and Section 3(1) of Tamil Nadu Public Property (Prevention of Destruction and Loss) Act, 1982 and Section 3(a) of the Explosives Act, 1884 and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003, in Crime No.330 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity between A3 and the defacto complainant with regard to exorbitant interest, on 29.04.2026, the petitioner and the other accused trespassed into the compound gate of the defacto complainant and thrown a bomb at the back of his car bearing Reg.No.TN-68-AP-6999 with an intention to murder him and thereby, they caused damage to the car and threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that already the co-accused was released on bail




CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

and the petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 30.04.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that due to previous enmity between A3 and the defacto complainant with regard to exorbitant interest, the petitioner and the other accused trespassed into the compound gate of the defacto complainant and thrown a bomb at the back of his car and caused damage to the car worth about Rs.60,000/- and the investigation is still pending and the petitioner has two previous cases. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner. He would further submit that the co-accused was already released on bail.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, nature of offence, and there is a money dispute between



CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

the parties and even according to the prosecution case, the unknown persons with helmet thrown a bomb and already the co-accused was released on bail and though the petitioner has 2 previous cases, in those cases, he was released on bail and also considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:


[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to 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 No.2, Kumbakonam**, and on further conditions that:

[b] **the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders.**

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/she is suspected;

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

[e] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with



CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

WEB COPY

the evidence;

[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 BNS.

(P D B J)
12.06.2026


dss

P.DHANABAL,J

DSS

To

5/6



CRL OP(MD). No.10957 of 2026

WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.2, Kumbakonam.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Nachiyarkovil Police Station, Thanjavur District.
3. The Superintendent, Sub Jail, Thanjavur.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10957 of 2026

Date : 12/06/2026