

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT TIRUVALLUR

Present: Dr. J. JULIET PUSHPA, Ph.D. (Law)

Principal District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur

Friday, the 6th day of March, 2026

CrI.M.P.No:623/2026

1. Boobalan, S/o Rangaiyan,
2. Subramani, S/o Govindan

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Tiruttani Police station
(Crime No: not known/2026)
CSR No. 384/2026

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 11.12.2026 u/s 482 of praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s G. Mohanram, R. Sasikumar, S. Naveenkumar, , the respondent police through the Public Prosecutor, and upon hearing the arguments of both sides, perusing the reply of the Public Prosecutor for the State/Respondent and perusing the records and material and hearing both sides, this court made the following:-

ORDER

Heard arguments of both side. Records perused. Petition filed u/s 482 of BNSS seeking to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners who apprehend arrest in Crime No.not known/2026 of Tiruttani Police station for the alleged offences u/s 126(2), 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(2) of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that, petitioner is innocent, there was only wordy quarrel between relatives, due to previous enmity, now the matter has been compromised, petitioners have no bad antecedents, they are to cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition, therefore prayed for granting the anticipatory bail.

Notice given to concerned police and reply received. The learned Public prosecutor argued that the defacto complainant lodged complaint stating that there was dispute over landed property and quarrel between the petitioners and the defacto complainant, in which the petitioners assaulted the defacto complainant with iron rod and wooden log, thus, based on the complaint, CSR No.384/2026 was registered and during the enquiry it was stated by the defacto complainant stated that they have compromised and thus, the CSR was closed,

The petitioner states in this petition/affidavit that there is no similar bail petition is pending before any other Court including Hon'ble High Court, Madras and the respondent has also not stated as to pending of any bail petition before Hon'ble High Court, Madras in this case. Hence, this Court considers that there is no impediment to entertain this petition and pass orders on merits.

The reply of the learned Public Prosecutor is recorded. Since the CSR No.384/2026 is already closed as the matter has been compromised, the question of apprehension of arrest does not arise. In the above circumstances when CSR is closed, this Court is not able to consider this petition for anticipatory bail. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 6th day of March, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s G. Mohanram
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Inspector of police, Tiruttani police Station