

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, THANJAVUR.

PRESENT: Thiru.P.Velmurugan, B.A.,B.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge, Thanjavur

Wednesday the 11th day of March, 2026

Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No.1620/2026

{CNR No: TNTJ01-0020762026}

\*\*\*\*\*

Aravinth, S/o. Balu

....Petitioner/ Accused

/ versus /

State of Tamil Nadu represented by Inspector of Police

Thanjavur Tamil University Police Station,

Cr.No.230/2024

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Tmt./Sel.B.Sindhuja, Learned Advocate appearing for the petitioner and the Learned Public Prosecutor Thiru.S.Sathiamoorthy, on behalf of the complainant and this court passed the following,

#### ORDER

This e-petition is filed by the petitioner 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 petitioner submits that the petitioner is being charged for offences u/s 448, 427, 294(b), 506(i) of IPC in Cr. No.230/2024 of Thanjavur Tamil University Police Station and he has not committed any offences as alleged and he has been falsely implicated in this case and also submits that this is a case of no injury and the investigation is almost completed. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition to be imposed by this court and hence, he seeks anticipatory bail for the petitioner.

The Learned Public Prosecutor submits that the de-facto complainant Damodharan entered into an agreement with the petitioner for Rs.29,00,000/- for constructing a house in the plot of the de-facto complainant by paying an advance amount of Rs.14,00,000/-, thereafter, it was found that the construction carried out by the petitioner was of substandard quality and a certificate to that effect was issued by Periyar Maniyammai University and based on the report, the Eigneers' Association directed the petitioner to compensate for the loss and accordingly, he issued a cheque, but it was bounced and subsequently, the de-facto complainant approached the Consumer Court, and the said Court directed the petitioner to pay compensation to the de-facto complainant and having aggrieved over the same, on 09.02.2024, the petitioner trespassed into the construction site,

damaged the shed to the value of Rs.25,000/-, abused the de-facto complainant in filthy language and threatened him with dire consequences. He further submits that if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he would commit the same nature of offence and investigation is still pending and hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

Rival submissions are taken into consideration. Perused the records. The occurrence appears to have arisen out of an earlier dispute between the parties relating to a construction agreement. The petitioner is said to have constructed the building in substandard quality for the de-facto complainant. The de-facto complainant approached proper forum and obtained an order in his favour. Even after passing of order by Consumer Court, the petitioner is said to have committed the alleged offences and caused damages to the value of Rs.25,000/-. The petitioner sought for anticipatory bail. Strong objection was raised on the side of the prosecution. By considering the above aspects, nature and gravity of the offence, the circumstances under which, the offence was committed and in view of the strong objection raised on the side of the prosecution, this court is of the view that it is not desirable to grant anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner.

In the result, this Anticipatory Bail Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 11th day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,  
Thanjavur.

Copy to:  
The Counsel for the petitioner.