

(2026) 06 MAD CK 0243

In the Madras High Court, Madurai Bench

Case No : Criminal Original Petition (MD) No. 9543 Of 2026

Muthuraman @ Left Muthu

APPELLANT

Vs

State Of Tamilnadu

RESPONDENT

Date of Decision : 05-06-2026

Acts Referred:

Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 — Section 115(2), 269, 296(b), 324(4), 351(3)
Arms Act, 1959 — Section 25(1)(a)

Citation : (2026) 06 MAD CK 0243

Hon'ble Judges : P. Dhanabal, J

Bench : Single Bench

Advocate : Muthupandi D, G.Ganesh Kumar

Judgement

P. Dhanabal, J

1. The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 28.04.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 324(4), 351(3) of BNS @ 296(b), 115(2), 324(4), 351(3) of BNS r/w 25(1)(a) of Arms Act in Crime No. 194 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity on 28.04.2026, the petitioner called the defacto complainant over phone and criminally threatened him. Thereafter, he came to the house of the defacto complainant on the same day at about 10.30p.m.,, abused him with filthy language, damaged the door of the house and also threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that in this case injured was discharged from the hospital. The petitioner has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 28.04.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that based on the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, the case has been registered against the accused. The petitioner has previous cases at his credit. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the nature of the offence and considering the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital and though the petitioner has previous cases to his credit, he has already been granted bail in those cases, as well as the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Madurai, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police at 10.30 a.m., for a period of thirty days and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/she is suspected;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

[e] the petitioner 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 or tamper with the evidence;

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

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.