



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 25897 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO. 25897 of 2025

1.Thamizhahagan
2.K.Tamizh Oviya
3.E.Murugan
4.S.Anbumani

Petitioners

Vs

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police
Tiruvannamalai East Police Station
Tiruvannamalai
Crime No. 492 of 2025.

Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest pending investigation in Cr.No. 492 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Suresh
For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 118(1), 351(3) of BNS in Crime No. 492 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks



anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant got married with the 2nd petitioner herein and thereafter, they got separated due to difference of opinion. In the meanwhile, A2 instituted a DVC proceedings against the de-facto complainant before the Mahalir Court, Tiruvannamalai. The de-facto complainant filed a divorce petition in the year 2024 before the Family Court, Tiruvannamalai, which is pending before the Court below for further adjudication. Subsequently, the matter was referred to Mediation. On 03.09.2025, when the de-facto complainant came out from the Mediation Centre, the petitioners/A1 to A4 herein assaulted the de-facto complainant with hands and threatened him with dire consequences. Later, the de-facto complainant admitted in a hospital as inpatient. Based on the information, the respondent police went to the hospital and recorded the statement of the de-facto complainant. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was some



matrimonial dispute between the 2nd petitioner and the de-facto complainant and the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the victim has been discharged from the hospital. He further submits that they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He also submits that the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to furnish sufficient solvent sureties for his release. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that on 03.09.2025, when the de-facto complainant came out from the Mediation Centre, A1 and A2 abused the de-facto complainant in filthy language and A2 to A4 attacked the de-facto complainant with hands and threatened him with dire consequences. Due to the impact, the de-facto complainant had sustained injuries and he was taken to the Government Hospital as in-patient and recorded the statement of the victim. Therefore, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Taking into the aforesaid submissions made by the learned



counsels on either side; that gravity of the offence committed by the petitioners; that the investigation has not yet completed, this Court is not inclined to allow this Criminal Original Petition.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

24.09.2025

MSM

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tiruvannamalai.

2.The Inspector of Police

Tiruvannamalai East Police Station

Tiruvannamalai

Crime No. 492 of 2025.

3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 25897 of 2025

K. RAJASEKAR, J.,

MSM

CRL OP NO. 25897 of 2025

22.09.2025