



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED :08.09.2025

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

Crl.O.P.No.19797 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.No. 14282 of 2025

1. Sana Kaleem
 2. Khurrath Ul Aian
 3. Liyaqath Ali
 4. Santhosh Kumar
- ... Petitioners

Vs.

The State Rep by,
Inspector of Police,
Arakonam Town Police Station,
Ranipet District
(Crime No.Not known of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory in
the event of arrest in Crime No. No Known of 2025 on the file of the
Respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.S, Shankar for
Mr.N. Mohammed Rize Mansoor

For Intervenor : Mr.S. Sarath Kumar

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




WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 353(2), 356(2), 351(2) of BNS & Section 6A of IT Act in Crime No. not known of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The first petitioner married the defacto complainant on 06.02.2025 as per Muslim rites and customs in the presence of the parents, relatives and friends. Subsequently the Walima ceremony was held on 09.02.2025. The case of the prosecution is that due to the matrimonial dispute between the couple, the first petitioner along with second petitioner gave false statement against the defacto complainant and his family members in Theevai Thedu Programme in Jaya plus Channel with the help of the 3rd and 4th petitioners. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the defacto complainant has approached the Secretariat office and established that she has been sexually harassed by the first petitioner



WEB COPY


which is far from truth. The sad illegal act is done by the defacto complainant in order to wreak out vengeance. Hence, prays to allow this petition.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail stating that the offence are grave in nature. If the petitioners are released on anticipatory bail they will create problems in the family. Hence, prays to dismiss the petition.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the issue arises out of a dispute between the husband and wife. Accordingly, the police have registered a case and conducted an enquiry and the same was closed.

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

7. On a perusal of records it appears that the matrimonial dispute between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant culminated into lodging various complaints by both the parties and resulting in filing



WEB COPY

defamation case against each other which affects the reputation of the individuals. Hence, this Court directs the petitioners as well as the defacto complainant that herein after they should not give unnecessary complainants against each other which affects the dignity of the family.

8. With the above directions, this Criminal Original Petition stands disposed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

08.09.2025

smn

To

1. Inspector of Police,
Arakonam Town Police Station,
Ranipet District

2. The **learned Judicial Magistrate No.1, Arakkonam**

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI,J.

smn

Crl.O.P.No.19797 of 2025
and
Crl.M.P.No. 14282 of 2025

08.09.2025