

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

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

Date: Thursday, the 02nd day of April 2026

Crl.M.P. No.834 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-001846-2026)

1. Mohanakrishnan, aged 48 years, S/o Elumalai,
2. Seetha, aged 36 years, W/o Mohanakrishnan,

Both are residing at :

No.22, Matha Kovil Street,
Neerpair village, Madurantakam Taluk,
Chengalattu District – 603 313.

.. Petitioners/accused

//Versus//

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

Cr. No.51 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.296(b) and 118(1) of BNS - 2023 .

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

ORDER

This petition is filed U/s.482 of B.N.S.S. to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

2. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of respondent police for the alleged offences U/s.296(b) and 118(1) of BNS - 2023 in connection with the Cr. No.51 of 2026 of respondent Police Station.

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

4. The case of the prosecution is that due to prior enmity, that on 07.03.2026 these petitioners abused the defacto complainant with filthy language, assaulted him with deadly weapons, thereby caused injuries. Hence FIR has been registred in Cr. No.51 of 2026 on the file of Chithamoor Police Station.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioners expressed his willingness to not-press the application in respect of the 1st petitioner. To that effect, he also made an endorsement in the petition. **Accordingly, the petition in respect of the 1st petitioner is dismissed as not pressed.**

6. The learned counsel for the petitioners would further submit that the 2nd petitioner/accused is an innocent person, she is no way connected with the said offence; the injured person was discharged from the hospital; moreover, the 2nd petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed by this court and she is ready to offer substantial sureties before the court and praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would submit that, the injured person has been discharged from the hospital.

8. It is submitted that the injured person was discharged from hospital. The 2nd petitioner seemed to be the first offender, no previous case is pending against her. The accused have permanent residence within the jurisdiction of the respondent police station and hence no possibility of fleeing from justice. Therefore, considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 2nd petitioner alone.

9. In the result, the petition in respect of the 1st petitioner is dismissed as not-pressed; the petition in respect of ther 2nd petitioner

alone is petition is allowed; The 2nd petitioner, in the event of arrest or on her surrender before the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur within 15 days, is ordered to be released on bail on her executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur, subject to the following conditions:

1. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce any one of identity proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity.
2. The 2nd petitioner/accused is further directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 15 days;
3. The 2nd petitioner should comply with the conditions contemplated U/s.482 (2) (i), (ii) and (iii) B.N.S.S.;
4. The 2nd petitioner/accused shall not tamper with the evidences or hamper the investigation in any manner;
5. 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 02nd day of April 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Cheyyur.
The Inspector of Police, Chithamoor Police Station.