

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF INDIA  
CRIMINAL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ /2026  
[@ SLP (CRL.) NO.8556/2026]

WITH

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ /2026  
[@ SLP (CRL.) NO.8641/2026]

WITH

CRIMINAL APPEAL NO. \_\_\_\_\_ /2026  
[@ SLP (CRL.) NO.8368/2026]

NEHRU IRULANDI

APPELLANT(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF TAMIL NADU & ORS.

RESPONDENT(s)

O R D E R

1. Exemption applications are allowed.
2. Leave granted.
3. These appeals arise from the common order passed by the High Court dated 24.02.2026 in CrI. O.P. (MD) No.2054/2026 by which the High Court while granting anticipatory bail to the appellants-herein in connection with Crime No.6/2026, registered with Perunazhi Police Station, Madurai, for the offence punishable under Sections 189(2), 329(3), 324(4), 115(2), 351(2) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 respectively (for short, "the BNS, 2023") imposed a condition that the appellants and other co-accused shall not interfere in the disputed

property until the conclusion of the Civil Suit instituted by the complainant.

4. While granting anticipatory bail as prayed for, the High Court imposed the following conditions:-

*"[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity;*

*[b] the petitioners 1 and 2 shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation; Further, the petitioners 3 and 4 shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners are directed not to interfere in the disputed property until the suit is over.*

*[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.*

*[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.*

*[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners are 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].*

*[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS."*

5. We take notice of the fact that the appellants are the defendants in the Civil Suit instituted by the complainant. The Civil Suit has been instituted for permanent injunction.

6. *Prima-facie*, it appears that the case of the appellant, namely, Nehru Irulandi as one of the defendants is that he has purchased the suit property.

7. Be that as it may, the Suit is of the year 2019. The plaintiff has not prayed for any injunction pending the Suit.

8. We are informed that an application was preferred praying for injunction under Order 39 Rules 1 and 2 of the CPC respectively, however, the same has not been taken up for hearing.

9. We are of the view that while granting anticipatory bail, High Court should not have imposed a condition which tantamount to granting of some relief in the Suit itself, which otherwise the Civil Court has not granted.

10. In view of the aforesaid, the condition no.9(b) is set-aside to the extent it has directed not to interfere in the disputed property until the Suit is over. Rest of the conditions shall be abided by the appellants.

11. If the complainant as plaintiff has any apprehension as regards the breach of peace, interference with the suit property, etc., he may pray for appropriate relief before the Civil Court or any appropriate forum in accordance with law.

12. In view of the aforesaid, the appeals are allowed in part.

13. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

.....J.  
[J.B. PARDIWALA]

.....J.  
[K.V. VISWANATHAN]

NEW DELHI;  
27<sup>th</sup> MAY, 2026.

ITEM NO.10

COURT NO.7

SECTION II-C

S U P R E M E C O U R T O F I N D I A  
R E C O R D O F P R O C E E D I N G S

Petition(s) for Special Leave to Appeal (CrI.) No(s).8556/2026

[Arising out of impugned final judgment and order dated 24-02-2026 in CRLOP(MD) No. 2054/2026 passed by the High Court of Judicature at Madras at Madurai]

NEHRU IRULANDI

Petitioner(s)

VERSUS

STATE OF TAMIL NADU &amp; ORS.

Respondent(s)

IA No. 142080/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 142078/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

WITH

SLP(CrI) No. 8641/2026 (II-C)

IA No. 143164/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 143163/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

SLP(CrI) No. 8368/2026 (II-C)

IA No. 139465/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING C/C OF THE IMPUGNED JUDGMENT

IA No. 139461/2026 - EXEMPTION FROM FILING O.T.

Date : 27-05-2026 These matters were called on for hearing today.

CORAM :

HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE J.B. PARDIWALA  
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K.V. VISWANATHAN

For Petitioner(s) :Mr. Zubin Dash, Adv.  
Mr. Dcosta Ivo Manuel Simon, AOR  
Mr. Deb Ganapathy, Adv.  
Mr. Guruprasad Naik, Adv.  
Mr. Gajendra Singh Negi, Adv.  
Mr. Dcosta Ivo Manuel Simon, AOR

For Respondent(s) :Mr. Sabarish Subramanian, AOR  
Mr. Veshal Tyagi, Adv.

UPON hearing the counsel the Court made the following  
O R D E R

1. Exemption applications are allowed.
2. Leave granted.
3. The appeals are allowed in part in terms of the signed order.
4. Pending application(s), if any, shall stand disposed of.

(HARPREET KAUR)  
COURT MASTER (SH)

(POOJA SHARMA)  
COURT MASTER (NSH)