



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 14.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.30758 of 2025

1. S.Mahendran

2. M.Malarvizhi

3. P.Ramakrishnan

4. R.Balamani

... Petitioners

Vs.

State Rep by

The Inspector of Police,
Amaravathi Police Station,
Tiruppur.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the Petitioners on anticipatory bail in relation to Crime No.124 of 2025 in the event of arrest by Respondent Police.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Hari Rajan

For Intervenor : Mr.M.N.Balakrishnan

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar,

Government Advocate (Crl.Side).

ORDER

The petitioners apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences under Sections 296(b), 115(1), 118(1), 351(2) of BNS, 2023 and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Harassment of Women Act in Crime



WEB COPY

No.124 of 2025, registered on the file of the respondent, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they are the family members and relatives of the first petitioner and that, on account of the defacto complainant having lodged a complaint against a relative of the first petitioner, the petitioners came to the place of occurrence and assaulted the defacto complainant. It is alleged that the second petitioner attacked her with a scissor, causing grievous injuries, on the thigh and backside, which resulted in severe bleeding. Similarly, the other accused were also implicated and are stated to have assaulted her. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the case is purely a matrimonial dispute and that the occurrence has been falsely foisted. It is further submitted that the allegations are exaggerated and have been with an ulterior motive. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that the victim sustained several injuries and is presently undergoing treatment. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police, submitted that the victim is still undergoing treatment and that the AR copy has been produced before this Court. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

7. This Court has also gone through the FIR copy and other records, it reveals that the victim has sustained various punctionure wounds. It is also submitted that, at the time of admitting the victim, statement was also obtained. This Court is of the view that the release of of the petitioners at this stage would hamper the investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

14.11.2025

kmm

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Amaravathi Police Station,
Tiruppur.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.30758 of 2025