



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : Thiru. S. SIVAKADATCHAM, B.Sc., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Saturday, this the 7th day of March, 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.1044/2026

CNR No.TNMD010017002026

Sadeeshkumar, S/o.Ganesan

... Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,

Avaniyapuram P.S. in Cr.No.461/2025

... Respondent/Complainant.

This e-petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.Ajithkumar, Advocate for the petitioner and of Public Prosecutor for the State, this court passed the following:

Order

1. Anticipatory Bail application u/s 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Heard both sides.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A3 would submit that this is 2nd petition of the petitioner and that the respondent police has registered a case against A1 and two others in Cr.No.461/2025 for the offences u/s 49, 296(b), 351(3) of BNS, 3 of Explosive Substances Act and 25(1)(a) of Arms Act and subsequently arrayed the petitioner as A3. The petitioner's name is not mentioned in the FIR. He has been falsely implicated in this case. The petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offences as alleged. Already, A1 and A2 were granted bail by this court. Investigation is almost over. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of police. The petitioner has not filed similar petition before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court or any other court. The petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this court and prayed to allow the petition.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that totally there are 3 accused (one named and 2 unnamed) in this case and the petitioner is A3. As per the case of the prosecution, there existed enmity between A1 and the defacto-complainant as

the petitioner assaulted the defacto-complainant's nephew. While so, on 04.09.2025 at 11.00 p.m., at the instigation of A1, two persons have come to the defacto-complainant's house in a two-wheeler, pelted an ignited petrol bomb on the defacto-complainant's house and the same exploded. On hearing the noise, the defacto-complainant came out and enquired them, for which, they have abused him in vulgar words and criminally intimidated him with dire consequences by showing a sword and fled the scene of occurrence. Hence, the complaint. Nobody injured. This court granted bail to A1 and A2 on 06.10.2025 and 05.11.2025. Investigation is pending and strongly objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner/accused are u/s 49, 296(b), 351(3) of BNS, 3 of Explosive Substances Act and 25(1)(a) of Arms Act. This is 2nd petition of the petitioner. The occurrence is said to have taken place on 04.09.2025. The learned Public Prosecutor raised strong objections stating that at the instigation of petitioner/A1, other accused have pelted an ignited petrol bomb on the defacto-complainant's house and the same exploded. This court already granted bail to A1 and A2 as per order in Cr.M.P.Nos.4557/2025 & 5100/2025 dated 06.10.2025 & 05.11.2025 respectively, considering their remand period. Whereas the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail, who cannot claim parity with them. As per prosecution, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much essential. There is no change of circumstances, after dismissal of earlier petition. Considering the above said facts, the nature of offences, strong objections raised on the side of prosecution and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage, accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 7th day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to: The J.M.No.6, Madurai.