

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT AT SRIVILLIPUTTUR.

Present: **Thiru.A.Kanthakumar, M.L.,**
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputtur.

Dated this the 10th day of June 2026, Wednesday.

Cr.M.P. No.1573/2026

1. Suriya (A1)
2. Saravanakumar (A2)
3. Palaniammal (A3)

... Petitioners/Accused.

/ Vs /

State through the Inspector of Police,
Mallanginar P.S
Cr.No.141/2026
U/s.296(b), 115(2), 74, 351(2) of BNS and
Section 4 of TNPHW Act.

... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.K.Muneeswaran, Advocate for the petitioners and Thiru.S.Thirumalaiappan, Public Prosecutor for the respondent and upon hearing the argument of both sides, this court made the following

ORDER

It is an application for anticipatory bail u/s.482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS).

FIR was registered against the petitioners/A1 to A3 for the offences u/s. 296(b), 115(2), 74, 351(2) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPHW Act. The occurrence happened on 31-05-2026.

As per FIR, on 31-05-2026 at about 3-00 pm when A1 was feeding his goat and put the waste near the defacto complainant's house and when he questioned, the accused abused him using filthy language, assaulted with hands, threatened to kill him and when his daughter intervened, the accused assaulted her and threatened her.

According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any such offence and prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that if the petitioners are granted

anticipatory bail they would commit similar types of offences again and hence he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of records would show that it is a case of abusing, assaulting and threatening. The learned P.P. strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. But he conceded that the injured discharged from the hospital and the petitioners have no previous case. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that it is only wordy quarrel and when discharging of rubbish this case has been happened.

Considering the fact that the injured is stated to have sustained only simple injuries and has already been discharged from the hospital, and further considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary for the purpose of investigation. FIR was registered against the petitioners/A1 to A3 for the offences u/s. 296(b), 115(2), 74, 351(3) of BNS and Section 4 of TNPHW Act. The occurrence happened on 31-05-2026.

As per FIR, on 31-05-2026 at about 3-00 pm when A1 was feeding his goat and put the waste near the defacto complainant's house and when he questioned, the accused abused him using filthy language, assaulted with hands, threatened to kill him and when his daughter intervened, the accused assaulted her and threatened her.

According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any such offence and prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that if the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail they would commit similar types of offences again and hence he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of records would show that it is a case of abusing, assaulting and threatening. The learned P.P. strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the on, hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with the following conditions.

Accordingly the petition is allowed and the petitioners/A1 to A3 shall be released on bail in the event of their arrest or on appearance before the Judicial Magistrate, Kariapatti, within two weeks on the following terms:-

i) The petitioners shall execute a personal bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for the like to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate, Kariapatti.

ii) The petitioners/accused shall appear before the respondent PS everyday at 6-00 pm for 30 days.

iii) The petitioners shall not abscond either during the investigation or trial, that the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

iv) The petitioners shall make themselves available for interrogation by a Police Officer as and when required.

v) The petitioners shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any Police Officer.

vi) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the Judicial Magistrate is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Judicial Magistrate himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji Vs. State of Kerala (2005) AIR SCW 5560.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 10th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Kariapatti.

The Inspector of Police, Mallanginar P.S