



IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, SIVAGANGAI.

PRESENT: **Tmt. K.Arivoli., M.A., M.L.,**

Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai.

Thursday, the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March - 2026

**Cr.M.P.No.519/2026** in (CNR No.TNSV01000860-2026)

**Cr.M.P.No.533/2026** in (CNR No.TNSV01000894-2026)

**Cr.M.P.No.519/2026**

1. Lingaperumal @ lingam, (Age 30) (A1) S/o.Muthuvanni,  
Door No.91, Arasanur, Samathuvapuram, Thirumanjulai Post,  
Sivagangai Taluk, Sivagangai District.
2. Prabhu, (Age 33) (A2), S/o.Kannan,  
Door No.2/133, Padamathur Village, Padamathur Post,  
Sivagangai Taluk, Sivagangai District.

. . . Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

The State rep. by  
The Sub-Inspector of Police,  
Karaikudi North Police Station,  
(Cr.No.47/2026)

. . . Respondent / Complainant

**Cr.M.P.No.533/2026**

Gurunathan, S/o.Ambalam,  
No.5/148, Rice Mill Back side, Thirumokoor, Madurai District.

. . . Petitioner/*Defacto* complainant

Vs.

1. Lingaperumal @ lingam, (Age 30) (A1) S/o.Muthuvanni,  
Door No.91, Arasanur, Samathuvapuram, Thirumanjulai, Sivagangai.
2. Prabhu, (Age 33) (A2), S/o.Kannan,  
Door No.2/133, Padamathur, Sivagangai.

. . . Accused persons

Vs.

The State rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Karaikudi North Police Station,  
(Cr.No.47/2026)

. . . Complainant

The petitions coming on this day for final hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.C.Ilangovan, Advocate for the Petitioners and of Thiru.SS.Babu Prasath, Advocate for the Intervener and of Thiru.A.Alagarsamy, Public Prosecutor for the State, after hearing both sides and perusing the written reply submitted by the respondent and records, this court delivers the following . . .



**COMMON - ORDER:-**

1. The petitioners are apprehending arrest for the offences punishable u/s.296(b), 109, 351(3) of B.N.S Act and had filed this petition u/s.482 of B.N.S.S., seeking for their release on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest.

2. According to the petitioners, they are ranked A1, A2 in the crime number and there are totally two accused in the present case and as against them, allegations have been levelled by the *defacto* complainant alleging that the petitioners have abused the *defacto* complainant with filthy language and assaulted him by using iron rod with an intention to murder, in which he sustained head injury and threatened him with dire consequences. According to the petitioners, this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipatory bail application and the injured has already been discharged from the government hospital and they are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The Petitioners had given undertaking that they would be ready to abide by any condition imposed by the Court and willing to produce sufficient solvent sureties to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate. Hence, the Petitioners pray for considering them anticipatory bail to them.

3. Per contra, the learned counsel for the intervener has stated that the defacto complainant/injured person has sustained grievous head injury due to this occurrence and the said occurrence was happened in public place and he is getting treatment in private hospital and custodial interrogation of the petitioners is requited in this case and in the event, if the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail, they may threaten the defacto complainant to withdraw the complaint. Hence, prays for dismissal of the bail application of the petitioners.

4. The respondent filed his detailed objections in writing and the learned



.3.

Cr.MP.Nos.519, 533/26

Public Prosecutor had submitted that investigation is still pending and the petitioners are involved in one previous case. In the event, if the petitioners are released on bail, they would abscond and may not appear before the Court by abiding the condition. Hence the Public Prosecutor strongly opposed the grant of bail application to the petitioners.

5. By considering the submissions of the parties and the fact that this is the 2<sup>nd</sup> anticipatory bail application filed by the petitioners and earlier anticipatory bail application was dismissed on the ground that the investigation was not completed and the injured was treatment in private hospital. Now, considering the fact that the injured is still taking treatment in private hospital due to sustain injury in the incident and the investigation is in premature stage as the petitioners have absconded themselves from 26.02.2026 and also there is no change in circumstances to consider this anticipatory bail application, this Court is not inclined to consider the anticipatory bail of the petitioners.

In the result, ***the anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.***

As far as the intervening petition is concerned, ***the petition is allowed.***

Given by me, this the 12<sup>th</sup> day of March - 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,  
Sivagangai.

**Copy to :-**

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Karaikudi.
2. The Public Prosecutor, Sivagangai.
3. The Inspector of Police, Karaikudi North Police Station.
4. Counsels for the petitioners and Intervener.

12.03.2026

Principal District Judge, Sivagangai