



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **06.11.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.30247 of 2025

1.Anrose @ Andrews
2.Krash Rani @ Gracee Rani
3.Deepa
4.Sathish
5.Sheeba

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Katpadi, Vellore District.
(Crime No.46 of 2025)

.. Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime No.46 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.E.Kannadasan
For Respondent	:	Mr.S.Udaya Kumar, Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 74, 85, 351(2) of BNS 2023 r/w Sections 4 & 6 of Dowry Prohibition Act, in Crime No.46 of 2025



seek anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the wife of the first petitioner/A1. They got married in the month of December, 2023, and thereafter the petitioners allegedly took possession of the defacto complainant's jewels and her salary earnings and subjected her to harassment. Subsequently, unable to bear the harassment, she lodged the present complaint. It is further alleged that the first petitioner had also lodged a complaint before the All Women Police Station, Katpadi, for which an enquiry was conducted, and thereafter, both the parties have been living separately. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that several complaints have been lodged by the defacto complainant, and the first petitioner had cooperated with the enquiry conducted in the year 2024. He further submitted that the matrimonial dispute between the first petitioner and the defacto complainant has been exaggerated and given a criminal colour. He further submitted that the first petitioner had earlier lodged a complaint before the All Women Police Station, Katpadi, pursuant to which an enquiry was conducted, and thereafter both parties have been living separately. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the FIR was registered recently and the investigation is not concluded. He further submitted that there are several allegations against the first petitioner and his family members. However, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and perused the materials available on record.

6. On perusal of the materials available on record and considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, it is seen that the first petitioner and the defacto complainant got separated in the year 2024 itself, since the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required for the purpose of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. 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 Judicial Magistrate, Katpadi***, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen 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 and on further condition that:

(a) 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)(i) the first petitioner shall report before the respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks.

(ii) 2nd to 5th petitioners shall report before the respondent police, everyday at 10.30 a.m, for a period of one week.

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners 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 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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]*; and;



(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

WEB COPY

06.11.2025

drl

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Katpadi.
2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Katpadi, Vellore District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.30247 of 2025

06.11.2025