

**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,(PCR)
Madurai.**

Tuesday, the 2nd day of June, 2026

**Crl.M.P. No.197/2026
in
(Cr.No. 187/2026, Melur Police station)**

Lingeshwaran
S/o. Ravichandran

...Petitioner/Accused

.. Vs..

1. The State of Tamilnadu
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Melur Police Station,
Madurai District.

...1st Respondent/Complainant

2. Duraipandi
S/o. Mandi

... 2nd Respondent/Defacto
Complainant

This Bail petition has been taken on file on 21.05.2026 and came up for final hearing before me today in the presence of Thiru. S.Surendar, learned Counsel for the Petitioner/Accused and of Thiru.P.Alagan, Special Public Prosecutor for the respondents/complainants and upon perusing the documents, hearing the arguments of both side and having stood over for consideration, this Court delivers the following:

ORDER

Heard. The petitioner is the accused in Cr.No.187/2026 of Melur PS U/s.296(b), 115(2), 351(2) BNS r/w.3(1)(r), 3(1)(s) of SC/ST (POA) Act.

2) The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant/victim of this case is a village Administrative Officer. The petitioner/accused worked as a driver under the defacto complainant's father in law. The defacto complainant lent some money to the petitioner. On 03.04.2026, at about 02.00 p.m., the defacto complainant met the petitioner and demanded the money back. Immediately, the petitioner abused the defacto complainant with filthy language and also made castiest slur and also slapped his cheek by the hand and also issued death threat.

3) The prosecution as well as defacto complainant strongly objected to release the petitioner on bail.

4) The petitioner was arrested by the police on 16.05.2026 and he is in judicial custody for the past 17 days. The prosecution has not produced any material to show that the petitioner obtain money from the defacto complainant. Today, the defacto complainant appeared before this court and submitted that he did not lent any money to the petitioner. According to him, he obtained money from his father in law and gave it to the petitioner. Further, no previous case or bad antecedent of the petitioner is brought to the notice of this court by the prosecution.

5) Considering the fact that the petitioner is in custody for the past 17 days and the nature of offence and the fact that material part of investigation should have been

completed by this time and no visible injury is caused the defacto complainant and the facts and the circumstances of the case this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

6) For the aforesaid reasons this petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties each for the like sum amount to the satisfaction of this court.

(Dictated to the Typist, Computerized by her, corrected and pronounced by me on this the 2th day of June, 2026)

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