

**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

**Thursday, the 26<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026**

**CrI.M.P.No: 690/2026**

1. Vasu S/o.Govind Nallakukkala
2. Dhaniya W @ Dhanasekar S/o.Ramadasu Nallakukulogu
3. Rajasekar S/o.Ramadasu
4. Chiranjeevi S/o. Ravi

....Petitioners/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,  
Patllipet Police Station  
(Crime No: 20/2026 )

.....Respondent/Complainant

**Petition dated: 16/02/2026 u/s 482 of B.N.S.S., 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.M.Thamilselvan, D.Ranesh, K.Prasanthkumar, D.Jagadeesan and the respondent police through the Public Prosecutor and 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 BNSS seeking anticipatory bail to the petitioner who apprehends arrest in Cr.No.20/2026 on the file of Pallipet Police Station for the alleged offences u/s 118(1) of BNS.

The learned counsel for the petitioners argued that, this case is in counter, there was a quarrel against between the defacto complainant and the petitioners due to land dispute, the petitioners are innocents, no way connected with the alleged offences, no one is injured and hospitalized, the petitioners have no bad antecedents, the petitioners are falsely implicated in this case and is ready to abide any conditions imposed by this court.

Notice given to concerned police. The learned Public prosecutor for the State raised objection to grant bail to the petitioners and argued that, due to distribution of water dispute, on 28.01.2026 at 16.00 hours, while the defacto complainant is in his house, where the petitioners came and there was a quarrel arose between them in a drunken state, they assaulted each other, the petitioners assaulted the de facto complainant with stone, knife and wooden log and threatened him with dire consequences, no one got major injuries no one in the hospital, based on the complaint FIR was registered u/s 296(b), 115(2), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS and investigation is pending. No previous cases as against the petitioners.

The petitioner states in his petition 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.

//2//

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, the petitioners are local residents and also first offenders. All the offences are punishable with imprisonment only upto 7 years. Thus, it does not appear that custodial interrogation of petitioners would be necessary.

Therefore, on considering

1. substantial part of investigation is completed,
2. that there is no major injuries,
3. the petitioners are local residents and also first offenders.
4. the representation of the learned counsel for the petitioners are local residents and also first offenders will cooperate for enquiry and will abide by any condition,
5. and also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on imposing conditions.

In the result, Anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner in the event of his arrest and on execution of a bond each for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for the like sum each to the satisfaction of District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Pallipet. The petitioners shall surrender before the said Magistrate within 15 days from today and report before the respondent police daily by 10.00 AM for 30 days. The petitioners shall abide the condition as contemplated u/s 482 BNSS Any violation of the conditions, the Judicial Magistrate is entitled to take action as per the Judgment of the Supreme Court in P.K. Shaji Vs. State of Kerala AIR 2005 SCR 5560.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 26<sup>th</sup> day of March 2026.

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,  
Tiruvallur**

**Copy to:-**

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s.M.Thamilselvan  
Thiru. S.Murthy, Public Prosecutor for the State  
The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate Pallipet  
The Inspector of police, Pallipet Police Station