

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

**PRESENT : Thiru.K.Poorana Jeya Anand, M.A., M.L.,
Principal Sessions Judge, Pudukkottai.**

Saturday the 07th day of March 2026

Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No:653/2026

{CNR No.TNPD01-0011742026}

1. Manimaran, S/o.Ganesan,
 2. Chandrasekar, S/o.Ganesan
 3. Ramaiah, S/o.Kuttiyaan @ Kuttiyakonar,
 4. Kuttiyakonar Nallusamy @ Nalluamy, S/o.Kuttiyaan @ Kuttiyakonar
-Petitioners/Accused

/Versus/

State of Tamil Nadu represented by Inspector of Police,
Maliyur Police Station,
Cr.No.31/2026

....Respondent/Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.M.Kulam Nabi Aasath, Learned Advocate appearing for the Petitioners and of Thiru.A.Anto Kaliselvan, Learned Advocate appearing for the Intervener /defacto complainant and the Learned Public Prosecutor Thiru.B.Venkatesan, on behalf of the Complainant and this Court passed the following,

ORDER

This e-petition is filed by the petitioners U/s.482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS)-2023, praying for anticipatory bail.

Notice was issued. Reply was filed by the prosecution.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are being charged for offences U/s. 191(2), 191(3), 296(b), 118(1), 351(3), 303, 115(2) of BNS in Cr.No.31/2026 of Malaiyur Police Station and they have not committed any offences as alleged and they have been falsely implicated in this case and also submits that the injured person was discharged from the hospital and the investigation is almost completed. He further submits that the 1st petitioner was arrested by the police during the pendency of anticipatory bail and hence he endorsed that this petition is not pressed as against the 1st

petitioner namely Manimaran, S/o.Ganesan, and there is no anticipatory bail application pending before the Hon'ble Madras High Court and the petitioners are ready to abide by any condition imposed by this court and hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

The defacto complainant has filed an intervenor application through his learned counsel who has submitted that due to civil dispute, and the victim is still taking treatment as an inpatient and he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioners.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submits that on 23.02.2026 due to the civil dispute, the petitioners herein had assaulted the defacto complainant with a stick and caused fracture injury. He further submits that the injured person was discharged from the hospital, but, the investigation is still pending and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

With regard to anticipatory bail, this court relied upon a case law reported in AIR 1980 SC. 1632 rendering by our Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a case of Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs.State of Punjab, wherein it has been held as follows:-

“The nature and seriousness of the proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant's presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and "the larger interests of the public or the state" are some of the considerations which the court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail.”

Both side arguments heard. Records perused. The occurrence is said to have taken place in between the parties. The injured person is said to have discharged from the hospital in this case. It seems that the material part of investigation would have been almost completed by this time. The only non-

bailable offence is Section 118(1) of BNS. The 1st petitioner was arrested by the police during the pendency of this anticipatory bail and hence this petition is dismissed as not pressed as against the 1st petitioner namely Manimaran, S/o. Ganesan. By considering the above aspects, other facts and circumstances of the case, nature of offences and in view of the decision cited supra and in the absence of any serious objection on the side of the prosecution, this court is of the view that the petitioners can be granted anticipatory bail.

In the result, this Anticipatory Bail Petition is allowed only 2 to 4 petitioners with the following conditions and the Anticipatory Bail petition is dismissed as not pressed as against the 1st petitioner:-

- 1) In the event of arrest or on their appearance before the Jurisdictional Magistrate, the 2 to 4 petitioners are ordered to be enlarged on bail on them executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/-each with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Jurisdictional Magistrate,
- 2) The 2 to 4 petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and also submit a copy of their Aadhaar Card or any other identity card issued by the Government in proof of their identity,
- 3) The 2 to 4 petitioners shall report and sign before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of 15 days (including holidays) from the next day of execution of bond before the Jurisdictional Magistrate, without fail and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation,.
- 4) The 2 to 4 petitioners shall comply with the conditions stipulated u/s 482(2) of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) - 2023 scrupulously,
- 5) The 2 to 4 petitioners shall surrender before the Jurisdictional Magistrate within 30 days from the date of this order, failing which, this anticipatory bail order shall stand cancelled automatically without any further reference to this court.
- 6) On breach of any of the above said conditions, the Jurisdictional Magistrate is entitled to take appropriate action against the 2 to 4 petitioners in accordance with law as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala reported in (2005) AIR SC W 5560
- 7) If the 2 to 4 petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under section 269 of BNS and

- 8) The Station House Officer of Respondent P.S. is directed to send a report to this court as to compliance of reporting condition by the 2 to 4 petitioners.

Pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 07th day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Pudukkottai.

Copy to:

The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Karambakudi.
The Inspector of Police, Malaiyur P.S.,
The Counsel for the petitioners.
The Counsel for the intervener.