



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 35992 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30-12-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP No. 35992 of 2025

B.Yuvarani

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep By,
The Inspector of Police
H4 Korukkupet Police Station,
Chennai District.
Crime No.591 of 2025.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of her arrest in respect of Crime No.591 of 2025 on the file of the Inspector of police, H4 Korukkupet Police Station, Chennai.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K Mohan Raj

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

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2), 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023 read with Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act (TNPHW), 2002 in connection with



the case in Crime No.591 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant alleged that the petitioner was having an illicit relationship with her husband. Owing to this allegation, a matrimonial dispute arose. It is further alleged that the petitioner, along with the husband of the defacto complainant, attacked the defacto complainant. Thereafter, due to humiliation, the defacto complainant consumed poison and was admitted to the hospital; however, she was later discharged.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the petitioner is innocent; that there exists a family dispute between the defacto complainant and her husband; that she has been falsely implicated in this case and that the custodial interrogation is not required in this case. Hence, prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing on behalf of the respondent would submit that there exists a family dispute between the defacto complainant and her husband and no previous cases are pending against the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned



Government Advocate (Crl.Side) for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.

WEB COPY

6. Considering the nature of allegations, the relationship and the family dispute between the parties; no previous cases are pending against the petitioner and since the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned XV Metropolitan Magistrate, George Town, Chennai on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only)**, with two sureties 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 anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further conditions that:

[a] the petitioner 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 petitioner shall report before the respondent police every **Saturday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of four weeks;**

[c] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[d] the petitioner 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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].

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

30-12-2025

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Internet: Yes
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Jeni

Note:

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the official



website of this Court.

2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in official website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.

To

- 1.The XV Metropolitan Magistrate,
George Town, Chennai
- 2.The Inspector of Police
H4 Korukkupet Police Station,
Chennai.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor, Madras High
Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 35992 of 2025



P.DHANABAL J.

Jeni

CRL OP No. 35992 of 2025

30-12-2025