

In the Court of Sessions, Tirunelveli Division
Before the Principal Sessions Judge, Tirunelveli.
PRESENT : **Thiru.N.VENKATAVARADAN, B.L.,**
PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, TIRUNELVELI

Wednesday, the 24th day of June 2026.

Cr.M.P.No.2612/2026

(CNR No.TNTL 0100 5028 2026)

Lathes @ Sathish, C/o.Amburose Asirvatham.

...Petitioner/Accused.

/Versus /

State: The Inspector of Police,
V.K.Puram P.S
Cr.No.163/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant.

Petition dated:15.06.2026 U/s. 482 of B.N.S.S. through e-filing prays to grant anticipatory bail.

This petition is coming on this day for hearing before me, in the presence of THIRU.U.SEKAR, Advocate for the petitioner and THIRU.K.SUBRAMANIAN, the Public Prosecutor for the respondent and upon hearing both sides arguments, this Court passed the following :

ORDER

The Petitioner/accused seeks anticipatory bail for the alleged offences under Sections.296(b),329(4),118(1),115(2) and 351(3) of BNS Act, registered by the respondent police.

The petitioner states that the petitioner apprehends, arrest , torture and harassment at the hands of the respondent for the offences under section 296(b),329(4),118(1),115(2) and 351(3) of BNS Act in Cr.No.163/2026. The Petitioner is innocent and he has not committed any offences. He was falsely implicated in this case. The alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 23.02.2026 and the same was reported on the same day. FIR is pending before the Judicial Magistrate Court, Ambasamudram. As per the allegations in the FIR, petitioner used filthy languages against the defacto-complainant, threatened and attacked the defacto-complainant, caused injuries to the defacto-complainant. As a matter of fact, already there was some wordy quarrel between the defacto-

complainant and the petitioner and due to this motive, this case was filed against the petitioner. This is a third petition. Injured discharged from the hospital. Therefore, seeks to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

The Respondent police filed objections stating that, in view of the previous enmity between the defacto-complainant and the petitioner who are neighbours, on 23.02.2026 petitioner attacked the defacto-complainant with hammer, caused head injuries to him. Therefore, respondent police objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail. If he released on anticipatory bail, he will abscond, will not co-operate in the main case and also will indulge in similar offences.

The point for consideration is: Whether the petitioner is entitled to the relief of anticipatory Bail as prayed for?

Point: Heard bothsides. Petitioner seeks anticipatory bail for the alleged offences of using abusive words, attacking the defacto-complainant with hammer and also for criminal intimidation. Prosecution objected to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail on the ground that petition caused head injuries to the defacto-complainant by the attack made with hammer. Earlier two petitions filed by the petitioner were also dismissed by this court. Under these circumstances, this Court upon taking into consideration of the nature of the allegations stated against the petitioner and the nature of the injuries sustained by the defacto-complainant , is not inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail and this petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, this anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open court, this the 24th day of June 2026.

PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE,
TIRUNELVELI.