



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **06.11.2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.30270 of 2025

1.N.Ranjith Kumar

2.K.Nagaraj

3.N.Amaravathi

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Sub Inspector of Police,
Chettipalayam Police Station,
Coimbatore District.
(Crime No.384 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.384 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners	:	Mr.Deepan Uday
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), 115(2), 351(2) of BNS r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, in Crime No.384 of 2025 seek anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioners is that the first petitioner is the



WEB COPY

husband of the defacto complainant, and their marriage took place on 09.03.2025. From the date of marriage onwards, the first petitioner allegedly used to abuse and assault the defacto complainant. However, upon the intervention of family members, she resumed her matrimonial life and continued to live with the petitioner. On 28.10.2025, she was allegedly not permitted to visit her father, and on 29.10.2025, at about 10.30 p.m., when her family members came to her house to take her to visit her father, the first petitioner refused and assaulted her with a ring bracelet, causing severe injuries. It is further alleged that at the time of the incident, the defacto complainant was seven months pregnant. She was thereafter taken in ambulance to the Government Hospital, Coimbatore, where she was admitted as an in-patient. Subsequently, she lodged the complaint before the respondent police.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that it is only a matrimonial dispute between the parties and the injured has been discharged from the hospital. 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 defacto complainant is 7 months pregnant and she had been brutally



attacked by her husband and the injured was discharged from the hospital.

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 FIR, it is revealed that the first petitioner had brutally assaulted the defacto complainant when she was seven months pregnant. Since the defacto complainant is a lady, and though injured has been discharged from the hospital, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the first petitioner. According, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed insofar as the first petitioner is concerned. However, since the custodial interrogation of the second and third petitioners is not required since there is no allegation of physical attack against them, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the second and third petitioners.

6. Accordingly, the 2nd and 3rd 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 District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Madukkarai***, 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) the 2nd and 3rd petitioners 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 2nd & 3rd petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the 2nd & 3rd 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.



06.11.2025

drl

WEB COPY

To

1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Madukkarai.

2. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Chettipalayam Police Station,
Coimbatore District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.30270 of 2025

06.11.2025