



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12104 of 2026*

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

( Criminal Jurisdiction )

Date : 24.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

**CRL OP(MD). No. 12104 of 2026**

1.M.Mohammed Infannul Hukk @ Mohamed Irfan

2.Mohamed Imran

3.Deenur Rafeena @ Deenur Rafirana

... Petitioners

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

Puthanatham Police Station,

Trichy District.

(Crime No.110 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.Haroon Rasheed  
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.S.Maya Perumal

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

**PRAYER :-**

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 110 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12104 of 2026*

the offences punishable under Sections 191(3), 296(b), 118(1), 126(2), 329(3)

and 303(2) of BNS, in Crime No.110 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons who are the brothers of the defacto complainant's wife, came to the house of the defacto complainant along with his wife Pareen Fathima scolded him and took away Rs.30,000/-, 5 sovereigns of gold jewels, the cell phones, and two wheeler RC Book from the defacto complainant and also threatened him with criminal intimidation. 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 the matrimonial dispute, the defacto complainant and the petitioners' sister are live separately. Due to the above said motive this present complaint has been lodged. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12104 of 2026*

offences are grave in nature. There was matrimonial dispute between the parties. Hence, the petitioners made criminal intimidation upon the defacto complainant. 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 he is going to file intervening application. He would further submit that the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant and taken sum of Rs.3 lakhs and 5 sovereigns of gold ornaments and those properties have not been recovered and strongly opposed the 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 family members, there is no previous 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



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12104 of 2026*

WEB COPY

fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Manapparai**, 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.

[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



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12104 of 2026*

Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

WEB COPY

[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, Manapparai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,  
Puthanatham Police Station,  
Trichy District.  
(Crime No.110 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



*Crl.O.P.(MD)No.12104 of 2026*

**P. DHANABAL, J.**

TM

ORDER  
IN  
**CRL OP(MD) No. 12104 of 2026**

Date : 24.06.2026