

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 08th day of June 2026, Monday.

Cr.M.P. No.1621/2026

1. Ganesan (A1)
2. Dhanush (A3)
3. Karunakaran (A4)
4. Samuthiram (A2)

... Petitioners/Accused.

/ Vs /

State through the Inspector of Police,
Vanniyampatti P.S.

Cr.No.109/2026

U/s. 126(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS

... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.M.Muthukumar, 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,A3,A4 & A2 for the offences u/s.126(2), 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS. The occurrence happened on 27-05-2026.

As per FIR, on 27-05-2026 when the defacto complainant and his friend Mareeswaran were travelling in a two wheeler near Pillaiyar temple, Achamthavilthan village, at that time A1 and A2 came on the opposite side by closely and likely hit on them and there arose a wordy quarrel between them. In continuation to that on the same date at 12-15 hours, when the defacto complainant and his friend Marieswaran were standing near the burial ground, the accused came there and abused them using filthy language, A1 assaulted with hands on his face and attempted to stab with liquor bottle and further A2 catch hold the defacto complainant and when the Marieswaran intervened, A3 assaulted the Marieswaran on his cheek with hand and further A1 assaulted on the small finger of Marieswaran, A4 kicked the Marieswaran with legs and all the accused threatened to kill them.

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 waylaying, abusing, assaulting and threatening. The learned P.P. strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the injured sustained only simple injuries and the injured were treated as outpatient. Considering that the injured were treated as outpatient and except 351(2) of BNS, the other offences are bailable and there is no previous case reported against the petitioners, 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,A3,A4 & A2 shall be released on bail in the event of their arrest or on appearance before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Srivilliputtur, 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 No.II, Srivilliputtur.

ii) The petitioners/accused shall appear before the respondent PS everyday at 6-00 pm 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 08th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Srivilliputtur.

The Inspector of Police, Vanniyampatti P.S