



Crl.OP.No.30319 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 07.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.30319 of 2025

1. E.Sathya
2. E.Jeeva

... Petitioners

Vs.

State rep by the ,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District.
(Cr.No.21 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in connection with Crime No.21 of 2025 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioners : Mr.D.Ilayaraja

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

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 316(2), 318(2), 351(2) and 85 of BNS (Section 294(b),



406, 417, 506(1) and 498A of IPC) and Section 4 of DP Act in Cr.No.21 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. This Court, by an order dated 18.08.2025 in Crl.O.P.No.30319 of 2025, dismissed the bail petition filed by the first petitioner, wherein it has been recorded that the first petitioner claimed himself to be a Sub-Registrar in the Registration Department, convinced the defacto complainant, and married her. Subsequently, he continuously harassed her and demanded gold jewels on various pretexts, which led to the lodging of a complaint and registration of an FIR.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that, on the date of occurrence, there was only a wordy quarrel between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant regarding a family issue. He further submitted that the defacto complainant, in order to take vengeance against the petitioner, lodged an exaggerated complaint against the petitioner and his family members as if they had committed the alleged offence. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.30319 of 2022

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Taking all the factors into consideration, and in view of the fact that the majority of the allegations are against the first petitioner and there is no change in circumstances, I am not inclined to consider the anticipatory bail petition of the first petitioner. However, as far as the second petitioner/mother of the first petitioner is concerned, there are no major or very serious allegations against her in the complaint. Hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the second petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the second petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest, or on her appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Thiruvallur, on the condition that she 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 second petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) 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 identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The second petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the second petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the second petitioner released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

8. This Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed as against the first petitioner.

07.11.2025

Vv



Crl.OP.No.30319 of 2022

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Thiruvallur

2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruvallur, Thiruvallur District.

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



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.30319 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

CrI.O.P.No.30319 of 2025

07.11.2025