



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : THIRU. M.SAISARAVANAN., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Wednesday, this the 17th day of June, 2026.

Crl.M.P.Nos.2616/2026 & 2590/2026

CNR Nos.TNMD010034342026 & TNMD010033702026

Sangili Karuppan, S/o.Ayyavu

... Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.2616/2026

D. Mohankumar S/o. Dhinakaran

... Petitioner/Accused
in Crl.M.P.No.2590/2026

Vs.

State through the Inspector of Police,
Teppakulam P.S. in Cr.No.171/2026

... Respondent/Complainant
in both petitions.

These petitions coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.M.Karthick, Advocate for the petitioners in both petitions and of Public Prosecutor for the State, this court passed the following:

Order

1. Bail application in Cr.M.P.No.2616/2026 u/s 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Anticipatory Bail application in Cr.M.P.No.2590/2026 u/s 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

3. Heard both sides.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners/accused in Crl.M.P.Nos.2616 & 2590/2026 submitted that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioners in Cr.No.171/2026 for the offences u/s 296(b), 74, 308(4), 115(2), 351(3) of BNS and 4 of TNPWH Act. The petitioner in Cr.M.P.No.2616/2026 is in judicial custody for the past 26 days. The petitioner in Cr.M.P.No.2590/2026 apprehends arrest at the hands of respondent police and is seeking anticipatory bail. The petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offences as alleged.

The petitioners are workers under the defacto-complainant's husband and that wordy altercation has taken place among them in respect of payment of coolie amount and the same was exaggerated by the defacto-complainant and lodged the present false complaint. Injured discharged from hospital. No similar petition is filed or pending before any superior courts. The petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this Court and that the petitions are to be allowed.

5. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that on 23.05.2026, A1 and A2 have assaulted the defacto-complainant's husband demanding mamool from him. When the defacto-complainant intervened and tried to rescue her husband, A1 instigated A2 to pull her saree. A2 pushed down the defacto-complainant's husband and pulled the defacto-complainant's saree. A1 also joined A2 and both of them pulled her saree, thereby outraging her modesty. On gathering of neighbours, A1 and A2 brandished a knife and criminally intimidated them with dire consequences and left. A1 is involved in 5 previous cases and he is a history sheeter. Custodial interrogation of A2 is required. Investigation is pending and objected to allow the petitions.

6. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioners/accused are u/s 296(b), 74, 308(4), 115(2), 351(3) of BNS and 4 of TNPWH Act. As per the case of the prosecution, A1 and A2 have assaulted the defacto-complainant's husband, that A1 instigated A2 to pull the defacto-complainant's saree, that A2 pushed down the defacto-complainant's husband, that A1 and A2 pulled her saree, thereby outraging her modesty and they have brandished a knife and criminally intimidated them with dire consequences. The reply submitted on the side of prosecution shows that nobody was injured and that no one was hospitalized. The arrested A1 is in custody for 26 days. Material part of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Further custodial interrogation of petitioner/A1 is not required. Though previous cases are reported against A1, considering the duress period of A1 and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is

inclined to grant bail to A1 alone on conditions. So far as the petitioner/A2 is concerned, he is seeking anticipatory bail. As per prosecution, custodial interrogation of A2 is very much essential and that investigation in respect of A2 is pending. Hence, considering the above facts, the nature of offences and the objections placed on the side of prosecution, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to A2 at this stage.

In the result, the petitioner in Cr.M.P.No.2616/2026 is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- along with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai subject to the following conditions:-

(i) After release, the petitioner in Cr.M.P.No.2616/2026 shall appear sign before the Inspector of Police, respondent police station **daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 30 days.**

(ii) The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation and shall not threaten the witnesses and shall not cause hindrance to the pending investigation.

(iii) The petitioner shall not commit an offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, of the commission of which he is suspected.

(iv) The petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(v) If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation Officer is within his discretion to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate, concerned for cancellation of bail as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **P.K.Shaji/Vs/State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W.5560.**

So far as the petitioner in in Cr.M.P.No.2590/2026 is concerned, the anticipatory bail application is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 17th day of June, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to

1. The J.M.No.1. Madurai.
2. The Inspector of Police, Teppakulam P.S.
3. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Madurai.
4. The Petitioner through his counsel.