



**IN THE III ADDITIONAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS COURT (PCR),
MADURAI.**

**Present: Thiru. R. JOSEPH JOY, M.A., L.L.M., M.B.A.,
III Additional District & Sessions Judge,
Madurai.**

Friday, the 8th day of May, 2026

**Crl.M.P. No.176/2026
in
(Cr.No. 141/2026, Kottampatti Police station)**

CNR.No.TNMD03-000276 -2026

Rajendran (Age 64)
S/o. Vellaisamy

...Petitioner/Accused

.. Vs..

State through The Inspector of Police,
Kottampatti Police Station,
Madurai District.

...Respondent/Complainant

This Bail petition has been taken on file on 05.05.2026 and came up for final hearing before me today in the presence of Thiru. K. Manikandan, learned Counsel for the Petitioner/Accused and of Thiru.P.Alagan, Special Public Prosecutor for the respondent/complainant and upon perusing the documents, hearing the arguments of both side and having stood over for consideration, this Court delivers the following:

ORDER

The petition has been filed by the petitioner/accused under Sec.483 of Bharatiya Nyaya Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), seeking for an order of bail for the



alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 109(1), 351(3) of BNS Act r/w Sec. 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of SC/ST (POA) Act.

2) According to the prosecution case, on 25.04.2026 at about 11.00 a.m., due to verbal dispute between the defacto complainant and the accused, the accused abused the name of the community of the defacto complainant and used filthy languages and assaulted him with knief and casued injuries and issued life threats. Hence complaint was lodged. The counsel for the petitioner submits that, the the case was registered on 25.04.2026 and the petitioner/accused was remanded to judicial custody on 26.04.2026 and he is in custody for the past 12 days. The counsel for the petitioner/accused further submits that, the petitioner/accused is falsely implicated in this case and he is a law abiding citizen and ready and willing to offer substantial sureties for his due appearance. Therefore, he prayed this Court to enlarge the petitioner/accused on bail.

3) The learned Special Public Prosecutor raised his objection to grant bail to the petitioner/accused by filing reply stating that the petitioner/accused has been charged for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 109(1), 351(3) of BNS Act r/w Sec. 3(1)(r), 3(1)(s), 3(2)(va) of SC/ST (POA) Act by the respondent Police Station in Crime No.141/2026. Further the Special Public Prosecutor has submitted that, if the petitioner is released on bail, there is a possibility of tampering and hampering the prosecution witnesses and the case investigation has not been completed. Therefore, the Special Public Prosecutor has strongly objected to the release of the petitioners on bail and prayed to dismiss the petition.

4) As mandated under Sec.15 (A) of SC/ST (POA) Act, 1989, this Court has issued a notice to the defacto complainant and on receipt of the said notice, he also



appeared before this court and filed intervener petition stating that, the accused assaulted him on his neck with knife and he is now undergoing medical treatment for the severe injuries sustained by him and if the petitioner/accused is released on bail there would be endanger to the life of the defacto complainant and his family. He has also shown the cut injury sustained by him in his neck in the occurrence. The said injury reveals that, the defacto complainant sustained serious injury in the vital part of the body that is neck.

5) This Court has considered the rival submissions put-forth by the learned Counsel for either side and perused the materials available on the records. The only question, which needs to be decided in this petition is as to whether the petitioner/accused is to be enlarged on bail?

6) Discussion:

Rival contentions are taken into consideration. Perused the case records. considering the submission of the Special Public Prosecutor and considering the fact that, the defacto complainant is still undergoing treatment for the injury and gravity of the offence and the case investigation has not been completed, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

(Dictated to the Steno-Typist, Transcribed and Computerized by her, corrected and pronounced by me on this the 8th day of May, 2026)

III Additional District and Sessions Judge (PCR),
Madurai.