



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.264 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 22.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.264 of 2025

Veeramani

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Pennadam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
(Crime No.178 of 2023)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in connection with Crime No.178 of 2023 on the file of Pennadam Police Station,Cuddalore District, the respondent herein.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Sugumar

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



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 174(3) of Cr.P.C and later altered into Section 306 of IPC in Crime No.178 of 2023, on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that at the time of marriage, the petitioner had promised the defacto complainant's daughter that after marriage, he will construct a new house. After marriage, the petitioner had started to demand dowry for constructing the house and abused her in filthy language. Hence, she lodged a complaint before the All Women Police Station, Ariyalur. Based on the said complaint, the parties were attended inquiry and both were advised to run their family happily. Subsequently, again the petitioner herein harassed the victim/wife. Unable to bear the harassment and torture, she committed suicide by self immolation . Hence, the case.



WEB COPY

3. Earlier anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner in Crl.OP.No.3184 of 2024 was dismissed on the ground that RDO Enquiry is pending and also considering the gravity of the offence committed by the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that now the RDO Enquiry was completed and report also filed. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and reported that however, RDO enquiry reveals that there is no dowry harassment, but there is harassment. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. However, the earlier order reveals that this petitioner was continuously harassed the defacto complainant and demanded money for the purpose of constructing the house.



Crl.OP.No.264 of 2025

WEB COPY

7. Taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side and also taking note of the fact that there is serious allegations levelled against the petitioner, I am not inclined to re-consider the anticipatory bail petition.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

22.09.2025

Vv

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Pennadam Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

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

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

4/5



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.264 of 2025

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.264 of 2025

22.09.2025



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.264 of 2023