



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **05.11.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.24513 of 2025

1.Venkateshwaran @ Pratheep Kumar

2.Dili Babu

3.Geetha

4.Deepa

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.
(Crime No.43 of 2025)

... Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.43 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.K.Sathishkumar
For Respondent	:	Mr.S.Udaya Kumar, Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For Intervener	:	Mr.V.Moorthi

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 85 & 318(4) of BNS Act r/w Section 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 in Crime No.43 of 2025 seek



anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant, Bhuvaneswari lodged a complaint alleging that the petitioners, acting in concert with false informations, had solemnized her marriage with the 1st petitioner. It is further alleged that they jointly demanded dowry in the form of a housing plot and a sum of Rs.5 lakhs, and that they misappropriated 15 sovereigns of gold jewels along with house hold articles worth Rs.3 lakhs. Hence the complaint.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and that they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that in November 2024, there was an exchange of notices between the parties regarding their matrimonial dispute. Subsequently, in January 2025, the first petitioner filed a petition for restitution of conjugal rights in HMOP.No.06 of 2025 on the file of Subordinate Court, Arakkonam, and after receipt of the summons in the said proceedings, the defacto complainant has lodged the present complaint. He further submitted that he



is ready to co-operate with the investigation and hence, prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that though the second petitioner was granted bail in this case, subsequently, he was involved in attacking the defacto complainant in connection with the same issue. Therefore, another FIR was registered in Crime No.337 of 2025 dated 14.05.2025 on the file of Arakkonam Town Police Station. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that in this case, the petitioners 2 to 4, who are the in-laws of the defacto complainant, were already granted anticipatory bail by this Court. He further submitted that the investigation is still pending. However, 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, it is seen that this Court on 16.09.2025, has already granted anticipatory bail to A2 to A4, who are the in-laws of the defacto complainant in this case.



7. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, the fact that matrimonial proceedings have already been initiated between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant and that the legal notice and reply notice have been exchanged, and since the custodial interrogation of the first petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the first petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the first petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the *learned Judicial Magistrate, Arakkonam, Ranipet District* on condition that the first petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), 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



WEB COPY

respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

(c) the first petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the first petitioner 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 first petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the first petitioner 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.

05.11.2025

drl

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Arakkonam,
Ranipet District.

2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Arakkonam, Ranipet District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

CRL.O.P.No.24513 of 2025

(2/2)

05.11.2025