



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12050 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 24.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 12050 of 2026

1.Vinoth @ Vijay
2.Mayakannan
3.Jothilakshmi
4.Pandiyammal
5.Shanmugavalli

... Petitioners

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
A.Mukkulam Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.108 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.A.Balaji
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.C.P.Hemkumar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 108 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12050 of 2026

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 189(2), 329(4), 118(1), 115(2), 324(4), 296(b), 351(2) of BNS, in Crime No.108 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there is a previous dispute between the parties in respect of construction of Vinayagar temple in their village. Due to which the petitioners came to the defacto complainant's house, abused them in filthy language, assaulted them using hands and spade handle and damaged the chairs in their house. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Due to previous dispute this false complaint has been lodged against the petitioners. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the offences are grave in nature. Due to dispute arose out of construction of temple



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12050 of 2026

in their Village the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant. The injured was discharged from the hospital. Investigation is still pending. The petitioners have no previous case. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submits that the defacto complainant collected funds for construction of temple in their village. While so, the petitioners along with others conducted boomi pooja to construct the temple, thereby, there was a dispute between them. Due to that previous enmity, the petitioners trespassed into the house of the defacto complainant and assaulted them and also damaged the two wheeler and chairs and the house. The defacto complainant sustained severe injuries, thereby, he strongly opposed to grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6.Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the records.

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, there is previous dispute between the parties regarding construction of temple, already A1 was arrested and released on bail, the injured was discharged from the hospital, that there is no previous



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12050 of 2026

case against the petitioner, and also considering all the facts and circumstances

of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to

the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Thiruchuli**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[b] the petitioners 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 petitioners shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12050 of 2026

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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)
24.06.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruchuli.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
A.Mukkulam Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.108 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12050 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 12050 of 2026

Date : 24.06.2026