

In the Court of the Principal District Judge, Dharmapuri.

**Present : Tmt.C.Thirumagal, M.L.,
Principal District Judge,
Dharmapuri.**

Monday the 01st day of June 2026

Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No.587/2026

1. Madhaiyan, Age 43, S/o. Perumal, A2,
2. Ganesan, Age 34, S/o. Marimuthu, A3,
3. Govindhan, Age 35, S/o. Kullugoundar, A4, ...Petitioners/Accused

//Versus //

State: The Inspector of Police,
Pennagaram P.S.,
Cr.No.127/2026.

....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated 25.05.2026 filed U/s. 482 of BNSS seeking to grant anticipatory bail for the offences U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS.

This petition coming on for hearing before me today in the presence of Tr.K.Jeeva, Advocate for the petitioner and of Public Prosecutor for the respondent/state and after hearing both side, this court delivered the following:

ORDER

This petition is filed U/s. 482 of BNSS seeking to grant anticipatory bail for the offences U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS in Cr.No.127/2026 of Pennagaram Police Station.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there is previous enmity and pathway dispute between the defacto complainant and accused for the past 6 months, who are

adjacent land owners and that on 17.05.2026, at about 2.30 p.m., when the defacto complainant and his wife, his father-in-law and his elder brother were proceedings in the Naganur bus stop, the accused (A1 to A4) came there and have jointly abused him in filthy language and A1 has assaulted the complainant with machete on his head and the accused have assaulted him with wooden log on his back and A1 has assaulted the wife of complainant with wooden log on her back and has assaulted the father-in-law of complainant with machete on his head and has assaulted the elder brother of complainant with rod on his head and have caused criminal intimidation. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners (A2 to A4) are innocents and they have not committed any offence and due to previous enmity a false case has been foisted against them and this is 2nd petition and have prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor represented that there is pathway dispute between the parties and the injured is taking treatment in private hospital and in this stage, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they may abscond and may tamper the witnesses.

5. Heard both sides. Perused the records. The FIR has been registered as against the petitioners and another U/s.296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS. The occurrence was said to have taken place on 17.05.2026. The FIR was registered on the same day itself. The occurrence said to have arose out of pathway dispute

between the parties. The learned public prosecutor stated that the injured person taking treatment in private hospital and if the petitioners are release, it may lead to law and order problem. Already the previous anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioners and another (A1) was also dismissed by this court in Cr.MP.No.551/2026 on 20.05.2026. This petition was filed on 25.05.2026. Further, there is no major change of circumstances in this case. The strong objection raised by the public prosecutor is also taken into consideration. Considering the nature and gravity of the offence and stage of investigation, this court is of view that if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they may abscond, tamper the witnesses and may involve in same kind of offences. Hence, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

In the result, the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in Open Court this the 1st day of June 2026.

**Principal District Judge,
Dharmapuri.**