



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.18002 of 2025

1.Arunraj @ Thmarai Selvam
2.Komathi
3.Dhandapani

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.
(Crime No.26 of 2025)

.. Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.26 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.Vinodhkumar

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

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 85, 115(2), 351(2) of BNS, in Crime No.26 of 2025 seek anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioners is that the first petitioner is the



husband, 2nd and 3rd petitioners are the in-laws of the defacto complainant.

It is alleged that the marriage between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant took place in the year 2020 and after few months, matrimonial disputes arose between them. It is further alleged that the petitioners demanded more jewels and forced her to leave the matrimonial home. When she informed them that she was pregnant, they compelled her to abort the child. Thereafter, she went to her parental home and delivered a child in the year 2021. Even after, the first petitioner did not visit the defacto complainant and not shown any interest to see the child. It is further alleged that the petitioners continuously demanded money from her to allow her to live in the matrimonial home. Hence, she lodged a present complaint against the petitioners.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that they have not committed any act of harassment as alleged and that the dispute arose only out of matrimonial difference. He further submitted that the defacto complainant left the matrimonial house and after a lapse of five years, she lodged a complaint against the petitioners. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the



investigation is still pending and the allegations are serious in nature.

Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and perused the materials available on record.

6. On perusal of the records and the FIR, it is seen that the matrimonial dispute arose in the year 2020 itself. It is further seen that, after the birth of the child in the year 2021, the parties did not resume their matrimonial life, and only after a lapse of about five years, the present complaint has been lodged by the defacto complainant. Therefore, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigating the case, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the ***learned Judicial Magistrate, Sholinghur***, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only), each with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to



arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on

further condition that:

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the first petitioner shall report before the respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation. The second and third petitioners shall report before the respondent police, daily at 10.30 a.m, for a period of one week.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with 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 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]***; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.



27.10.2025

WEB COPY To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate,
Sholinghur.
2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.18002 of 2025

27.10.2025