



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11917 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 23.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 11917 of 2026

Gordinal Immanuvel

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Town North Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.312 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Mutu Ganesa Pandian
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian
Counsel for State of TN (Crl. side)

For Intervenor : Ms.Meenakshi

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 312 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS and



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11917 of 2026

Section 4 of TNPHW Act, in Crime No.312 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the petitioner are husband and wife. The petitioner used to drink and abuse the defacto complainant frequently. They do not have children. He often abused the defacto complainant and harassed her. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits 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. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the offences are grave in nature. The petitioner often harassed the defacto complainant. There is matrimonial dispute between the parties. There is no previous case against the petitioner. Investigation is still pending. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Ms. Meenakshi, learned counsel appearing for the intervenor seeks



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11917 of 2026

adjournment to file intervening petition. But, considering the nature of the offence and the relationship of the parties this Court rejected the request made by the counsel for the intervenor. But, the learned counsel for the intervenor made his submissions. She submitted that the petitioner is drunken continuously and abused the defacto complainant. The offences are grave in nature, frequently, disturbing the defacto complainant. Hence, she strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, there is a dispute between the family members, the injured was discharged from the hospital, there is no previous case against the petitioner and considering all other facts and circumstances of the 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 appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judge, Additional Mahila Court, Dindigul, on condition that



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11917 of 2026

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 Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police at 10.30 a.m., on every Saturday for a period of four weeks, thereafter, as and when required for 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].



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11917 of 2026

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be

WEB COPY registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

(P D B J)
23.06.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judge, Additional Mahila Court, Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Town North Police Station,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.11917 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 11917 of 2026

Date : 23.06.2026