

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Date: Wednesday, the 18th day of March 2026

Crl.M.P. No.648 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-001487-2026)

1. Manokaran, aged 63 years, S/o.Shanmugam,
2. Kamaraj, aged 57 years, S/o.Shanmugam,
3. Sugumar, aged 28 years, S/o.Kamaraj,

All are residing at:

Parameshwari Amman Kovil Street,
Thaiyur, Chengalpattu Dist - 603 103.

.. Petitioners/accused

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Thazhambur Police Station

Cr. No.41 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.191(2), 329(4), 296(b), 118(1), 324(4), 351(2) of BNS, 2023.

// and //

Murugan, S/o.Varadhan,

.. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in CMP No.738 of 2026

This petition for anticipatory bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.P.Ashok Kumar, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/accused, M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/complainant and of M/s.V.Saravanan, the learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following:

ORDER

The petition in Crl.M.P. No.648 of 2026 is filed by the petitioners/accused U/s.482 of B.N.S.S. to enlarge them on anticipatory bail, whereas

the petition in Crl.M.P. No.738 of 2026 is filed by the defacto complainant/ intervenor in order to object to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

2. The petitioners/accused apprehends arrest at the hands of respondent police for the alleged offences U/s.191(2), 329(4), 296(b), 118(1), 324(4), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in connection with the Cr. No.41 of 2026 of respondent Police Station.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply submitted. Heard both sides. Records perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that both the petitioners and the defacto complainant family are relatives. Due to the dispute regarding sale of a ancestral property, the petitioners came into the defacto complainant and compelled his wife to sign in the sale document, but she refused. Due to that, the accused have abused them with filthy language, assaulted them with plastic chair and caused injuries and also threatened them with dire consequences. Thereby, a case has been registered in Cr. No.41 of 2026 on the file of respondent police station.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/accused would submit that the petitioners/accused are innocent, they have been falsely implicated in this case; the injured person has been discharged from the hospital; moreover, the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon them and they are ready to offer substantial sureties before the court, thereby prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, re-iterated the prosecution case. He would further submitted that the injured person has been discharged from the hospital.

7. The learned counsel who is appearing for the defacto complainant/

intervenor vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. From the submissions it appears that the petitioners and the defacto complainant family are relatives and the dispute is regarding sale of property. It appears that the injured person has been discharged from the hospital. No deadly weapons was used in the occurrence. Except the offence U/s.118(1) of BNS, 2023, other offences are bailable in nature. The petitioners seemed to be the first offenders, no previous case is pending against them. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioners, injured person has been discharged from the hospital and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

9. In the result, Crl.M.P. No.648 of 2026 is allowed; anticipatory bail granted to the petitioners/accused with the following conditions. The intervenor petition in Crl.M.P. No.818 of 2026 is closed.

1. The petitioners, in the event of arrest or their surrender before the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thiruporur within 15 days, are ordered to be released on bail on their execution of bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the same Magistrate;
2. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce copy of any identify proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity;
3. The petitioners are directed to report before the respondent station daily at 10.30 A.M. for 15 days;
4. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or hamper the investigation in any manner;

5. The petitioners should comply with the conditions contemplated u/s 482 (2)(i), (ii) and (iii) of B.N.S.S.;
6. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself in accordance with the decision *AIR 2006 S.C. 100 – P.K. Shaji vs State of Kerala.*

Pronounced by me in open court, on this the 18th day of March 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Thiruporur.
The Inspector of Police, Thazhambur Police Station