



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 15953 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 23-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 15953 of 2025

Bijoy Y Das

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State rep by
The Inspector of Police, Central Crime
Branch-I Chennai.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before any court in connection with the case in Crime No.44 of 2025 pending on the file of the Respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Anirudh A Sriram

For Intervenor Mr.S.Yogarajasekar

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Udaya Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 307, 294(b), 506(1), 465, 468, 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Woman Act, 1998 (TNPHW Act), in Crime No.44 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that A1 is the husband of the defacto complainant and the petitioner/A5 is the brother-in-law of A1. A1 and the defacto complainant were known to each other since 2009. After obtaining the consent of both families, their engagement took place on 30.09.2022, and subsequently, their wedding was solemnized on 12.03.2023 at Chennai. Although they were in a long-term love relationship, differences arose within three months after their marriage, turning their happy life into a dreadful and painful relationship. The petitioner herein alleged to have harassed the defacto complainant by demanding money. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He would contend that the petitioner is the brother-in-law of A1. Due to difference of opinion, a case



was registered in Crime No.44 of 2025 on 13.03.2025 and that the petitioner is no way connected to the present case. The learned counsel submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that although it was a love-cum-arranged marriage, A1 had demanded huge amount of money as dowry and further, A1 and the petitioner herein had made many attempts to spoil and misuse the reputation of the defacto complainant's family.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the A1 and his family members were involved in many criminal cases and they have bad antecedents. He further pointed out that the Whatsapp chats between A1 and the defacto complainant would show that A1 along with other accused had created a forged rental agreement with forged signature of the defacto complainant. A1 to A4 were already granted bail by this Court in Crl.O.P.Nos.14946 & 14599 of 2025 dated 13.06.2025 respectively. He further submitted that the investigation is not completed. Therefore, he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6.Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record,



including the First Information Report.

WEB COPY

7.I have also gone through the orders passed by this Court in Crl.O.P.Nos.14946 & 14599 of 2025 dated 13.06.2025 wherein this Court has elaborately considered this submissions of both sides including the fabrication of rental agreement and after considering the submissions regarding the rental agreement inclined to grant anticipatory bail. Hence, I am of the view that the petitioner is also a similarly placed person and entitled for anticipatory bail on the ground of parity. Accordingly, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner subject to certain conditions:

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned **11th Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Saidapet, Chennai**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** **with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of



WEB COPY

receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

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

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 15953 of 2025



23-10-2025

gbi

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



CRL OP No. 15953 of 2025



WEB COPY

1. The State rep by
The Inspector of Police, Central Crime
Branch-I Chennai.
2. The 11th Metropolitan Magistrate
Court, Saidapet, Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 15953 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.
gbi

**CRL OP No. 15953 of
2025**

23-10-2025