



CrI.OP(MD)No.11661 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

WEB COPY

Today, this matter is listed under the caption “For Being Mentioned” at the instance of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

2. When the matter was taken up for hearing, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that, in the order dated 19.06.2026, the name of the petitioner/sole accused has been erroneously mentioned as “Vingesh” instead of “Vignesh”. Therefore, he prayed that the said typographical error be corrected and a fresh copy of the order be issued.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent also conceded to the submission made by the learned counsel for the petitioner.

4. In view of the above, the Registry is directed to carry out necessary correction by substituting the name “Vingesh” with “Vignesh” in the order dated 19.06.2026 passed in CrI.O.P.(MD) No.11661 of 2026 and issue a fresh order copy to the petitioner forthwith.

22.06.2026

Note : *Issue order copy on 22.06.2026.*
mkn



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11661 of:




P.DHANABAL, J.

mkn

Crl.OP(MD)No.11661 of 2026

22.06.2026



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 19/06/2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.11661 of 2026

Vingesh

... Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by
Inspector of Police,
Sattur Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
In Crime No. 287 of 2026..

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.Kottaichamy P,


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

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Crime No. 287 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 29.05.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 126(2), 296(b), 351(3) and Section 3 of TNPPDL Act r/w 25(1)(a) of Arms Act in Crime No. 287 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 28.05.2026 at about 05.45p.m., while the defacto complainant was working as a Driver in the Fire Office vehicle and drove the vehicle near Mettamalai Ambedkar Colony, the accused drove his two wheeler in front of his vehicle. When the defacto complainant blown horn, the petitioner waylaid him and abused and also threatened him to kill with aruval. 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 no one injured in the occurrence. The petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 29.05.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that based on the complaint lodged by the defacto




complainant the case has been registered against the accused persons. He would further submit that though charge sheet has been filed before the concerned Court, considering the nature of offence and previous antecedents of the petitioner, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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, the nature of the offence and the fact that nobody injured in this case and further considering the fact that though the petitioner has previous cases to his credit, he has already been granted bail in those cases, as well as taking into account of 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, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and 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, Sattur, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police



daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of thirty days, thereafter, as and when required for interrogation before the respondent;

WEB COPY

[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 him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with 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)
19.06.2026

PNM

6/8



WEB COPY

CrI.O.P.(MD)No.11661 of:



TO

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Sattur.
2. The Superintendent, District Jail, Virudhunagar
3. The Inspector of Police, Sattur Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11661 of:



P. DHANABAL,J

PNM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.11661 of 2026

Date : 19/06/2026