



WEB COPY



CRL.OP No.. 28477 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 03.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.OP.No. 28477 of 2025

1.S.Murali
2.M.Lalitha
3.M.Vivek

..Petitioners

Versus

The State, Represented by
The Inspector of Police
AWPS-W7 Police Station
Anna Nagar, Chennai District.

..Respondents

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of their arrest a case in Crime No.11 of 2024 pending investigation on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioners : Ms.Geeta Ramaseshan
for Mrs.R.Sumithra Chakkaravarthi

For Respondents : Mr.S.Udayakumar,
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

--



CRL.OP No.. 28477 of 2025

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 498A, 294(b) and 406 of BNS, 2023 [Corresponding to Sections 498-A, 294(b) and 406 of IPC in Crime No. 11 of 2024 seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioners is that the 3rd petitioner had married the de-facto complainant. At the time of marriage, the de-facto complainant had given 370 sovereigns of gold jewels & household articles to the 3rd petitioner. In the meanwhile, the 3rd petitioner had developed an illegal intimacy with other women, when the same was questioned by de-facto complainant, there was some quarrel between them, the de-facto complainant left from the matrimonial home. Based on the complaint given by the de-facto complainant, the respondent police registered a case against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that there was some matrimonial dispute between the 3rd petitioner and the de-facto



WEB COPY

complainant. He further submits that the petitioners had filed CrI.O.P.No. 11418 of 2024 and the same was dismissed by order dated 24.07.2025. 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) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that investigation has been completed and final report has also been filed. However, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsels and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the fact that investigation has been completed and final report has also been filed; that the case was of the year 2024, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail



in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai-8**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

[b] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the Application for Surety ship [Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[c] the petitioners/A1&A3 shall appear before the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai-60 008, at 10.30 am for a period of two weeks.



CRL.OP No.. 28477 of 2025

[d] the petitioner/A2 shall appear before the learned V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai-60 008, at 10.30 am for a period of one week.

[e] On breach of any of the aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court themselves as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)13 SCC 283]**;

[f] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

03.11.2025

MSM

To

1. V Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore,
Chennai-60 008

2.The Inspector of Police

AWPS-W7 Police Station

Anna Nagar, Chennai District.

3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

Page Nos.5/6



WEB COPY



CRL.OP No.. 28477 of 2025

K. RAJASEKAR, J.,

MSM

CRL.OP.No. 28477 of 2025

03.11.2025

Page Nos.6/6