



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.21132 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.21132 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.No.16240 of 2025

G.Anand Raj

... Petitioner

Vs.

State represented by
Inspector of Police,
W19, All Women Police Station,
Adayar, Chennai – 600 020.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.3 of 2025 on the file of the Inspector of Police, W19, All Women Police Station, Adayar, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Nagarajan

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

For Intervenor : Ms.S.P.Arthi

ORDER



WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 85, 316(2) and 318(4) of BNS in Cr.No.3 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner claiming himself running a reputed company and earning huge income and married the defacto complainant herein and subsequently, he harassed her and demanded more money and also physically attacked her, while she was under pregnancy. The further allegation is that the petitioner is not only cheated the defacto complainant herein and also many more woman in similar modus. Hence, she has lodged the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and that he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner got married with the defacto complainant and she had left him voluntarily and subsequently it revealed that the defacto complainant is having relationship with another persons and he has questioned about the same, lodged a complaint against her, but, there is no action taken against her. Per contra, on the basis of counter blast, complaint lodged by the defacto complainant and case has been registered and further submitted that



WEB COPY

he is always ready to take care of the defacto complainant, however, she has refused to join with him. Hence, he prayed that anticipatory bail may be granted to the petitioner.

4. The learned Advocate appearing for the Intervenor submitted that the petitioner is a habitual offender and used to approach the women to induce them to marry and by stating he is having good financial background and thereafter swindled the money from them. He further submitted that the family members of the defacto complainant are also very much suffered by the petitioner. He also submitted that several FIRs have been registered against the petitioners. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that based on the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant, this case was registered on 16.07.2025 and investigation in this case is pending and further confirmed that the petitioner is having four other FIRs. Based on the various court orders, the other cases registered against the petitioner have been further dropped. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.21132 of 2025

6. I have gone through the records and connected records.

7. The contentions of the FIR reveals that various types of harassment made by the petitioner and also the way in which she was cheated. There is also an admitted case of the petitioner that several similar complaints that the petitioner had cheated several ladies under the pretext of marrying them, and subsequently, swindled money from them. Investigation is also pending.

8. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by both counsel, I am of the view that since the petitioner has bad antecedents, granting anticipatory bail may pave the way for committing further offences. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.


9. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, the connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

26.09.2025

Vv

To

4/6



Crl.OP.No.21132 of 2022

1. The IX Metropolitan Magistrate,
Saidapet, Chennai.

2. The Inspector of Police,
W19, All Women Police Station,
Adayar, Chennai – 600 020.

3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.21132 of 2025

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.21132 of 2025

26.09.2025