



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 28907 of 2025

1. DEEPAK
2. KARUPPUSAMY
3. SUBASHINI
4. ARTHI

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State By The Inspector Of Police
All Women police Station,
Ramanathapuram, Coimbatore District.
Crime No. 56 of 2025.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in Crime No. 56 of 2025 in the event of their arrest, pending investigation on the file of the Respondent_police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Muthupandi V

For Respondent(s): 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 85 of BNS 2023, in Crime No.56 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the 1st petitioner, who married the defacto complainant in 2023, allegedly joined hands with other accused to harassed and physically abused her from the beginning of their marriage. Although they were separated for some period, the 1st petitioner approached the defacto complainant in December 2024, tendered an apology, and requested her to resume marital life. She agreed, but it is alleged that the 1st petitioner continued to subject her to various forms of harassment and torture, including sexual abuse. On 05.05.2025, the 1st petitioner allegedly assaulted her severely, including attempting to strangle her. The family members intervened, called the police, and after police intervention, she was directed to lodge a complaint, which she subsequently filed with the respondent police.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the dispute is a mere quarrel between the husband and wife. He further submitted that the other petitioners are no way connected with the offence and they are ready to abide any condition that may be imposed on while granting them on anticipatory bail by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) for the respondent police reported that there are four accused in this case; the 1st petitioner is the husband, the 2nd petitioner is father-in-law, the 3rd petitioner is mother-in-law, and the 4th petitioner is sister-in-law of the victim. The majority of the allegations are against A1. He opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. I have perused the FIR and other connected records, which reveal disturbing facts, including various forms of harassment inflicted upon the victim. The majority of the allegations are severe and are directed against A1. Therefore, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner/A1. However, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 2, 3 & 4 subject to certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, petitioners 2, 3 & 4 are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Mahila Judge, Coimbatore, on condition that each of the petitioners 2, 3 & 4 shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty thousand only)** **each** 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, failing which, the petition for Interim



anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further conditions that:

WEB COPY

[a] the petitioners 2, 3 & 4 and 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 petitioners 2, 3 & 4 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.

[c] the petitioners 2, 3 & 4 shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioners 2, 3 & 4 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 petitioners 2, 3 & 4 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 2, 3 & 4 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].



WEB COPY

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

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition in respect of 1st petitioner is dismissed and in respect of petitioners 2, 3 & 4 is ordered.

25-10-2025

gbi

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



WEB COPY

- 1.State By The Inspector Of Police
All Women police Station,
Ramanathapuram, Coimbatore District.
Crime No. 56 of 2025.
- 2.The Mahila Judge, Coimbatore.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 28907 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.
gbi

**CRL OP No. 28907 of
2025**

25-10-2025