



CRL OP(MD). No.11579 of 2026

WEB COPY

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.11579 of 2026

Ayyanar

... Petitioner/Accused

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep
By the Inspector of Police,
Vanniyampatti Vilakku, Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.116 of 2026).

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.J.Yogeswaran,

For Intervener : Mr.S.Gurumurthy

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

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Crime No.116 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.



CRL OP(MD), No.11579 of 2026

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 06.06.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 288, 125(a) of BNS r/w 9(B)(1)(a) of Indian Explosive Act @ Sections 288, 105 BNS r/w 9(B)(1)(a) of Indian Explosive Act in Crime No. 116 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that on 05.06.2026 at about 01.10 p.m., while the defacto complainant, who is the Village Administrative Officer and the Village Assistant were engaged in official duty and received an information about the accident and went to the spot ie., APR Fireworks Factory and conducted inquiry and it was found that one Karuppasamy had sustained injuries due to the explosion of raw materials while he was working in the Chemical Store Room of the factory. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in



CRL OP(MD). No.11579 of 2026

this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. However, he has already paid compensation of Rs.5 lakhs to the family of the deceased. The petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 06.06.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervener would submit that due to the negligence of the accused persons, the alleged occurrence had happened and they have cleaned the premises and erased the evidence, in order to escape from the clutches of law. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner. However, he would concede that he has received compensation of Rs.5 lakhs.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.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. Considering the stage of investigation, previous antecedents of the petitioner and the offences are grave in nature, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD), No.11579 of 2026

WEB COPY

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the nature of the offence and the fact that the petitioner has already paid a sum of Rs.5 lakhs towards compensation to the deceased's family and also considering the fact that though the petitioner has previous cases to his credit, the petitioner has got bail in the previous cases registered against him, 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 No.II, Srivilliputhur**, and on further conditions that:*



CRL OP(MD), No.11579 of 2026

WEB COPY

*[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 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].



CRL OP(MD). No.11579 of 2026

WEB COPY

*[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can
be registered under Section 269 BNS.*

(P D B J)
19.06.2026

PNM

TO

1. The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Srivilliputhur
2. The Superintendent, District Jail, Virudhunagar
3. The Inspector of Police,
Vanniyampatti Vilakku, Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.11579 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

PNM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.11579 of 2026

Date : 19/06/2026