



CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 01-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

1. Azeesa banu

2. Abdul Majeeth

3. Mohamed Hassan Ali

Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Telangana Rep.by
The Inspector of Police, Karimnagar Women
Police Station, Karimnagar District.
(Cr.No.83 of 2025).

2. State of Tamil Nadu Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Town Police Station,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District,
Crime No.85 of 2025

Respondents

For Petitioners:

M/s.Paranjothi, for
KBS Law Office.

For Respondents:

Mr.A.S.Abul Kallam Azad,
Government Advocate (Criminal side)



CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

Prayer: For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.83/2025 on the file of the 1st respondent police.

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the 2nd respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 85 read with 3(5) of BNS and Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, in Crime No.83 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent police, seeks interstate anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioners had been accused of non-bailable offences committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction limit of the State of Tamil Nadu, has approached this Court for anticipatory bail, so as to enable him to approach appropriate Court.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners herein are in-laws of the defacto complainant and she was harassed and demanded more dowry by her in-laws/petitioners herein and she was also insisted her to settle the property in favour of her husband/ A-1 which situate at Karimnagar District. Hence, a case has been registered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners



CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

WEB COPY

have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The 1st and 2nd petitioners are inlaws of the defacto complainant and they are aged persons and they are suffering from various aged ailments. He further submitted that the 3rd petitioner is the only person looking after the 1st and 2nd petitioners. There is no specific allegation against these petitioners and the allegations are vague and they are not demanded dowry from the defacto complainant. Hence, they seek interim anticipatory bail for the petitioners to enable them to approach the appropriate Court and seek regular anticipatory bail. He further submits that this Court, in similar circumstances, granted interim anticipatory bail to the accused to enable them to seek appropriate bail orders from the concerned Court.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents.

6. The issue as to whether, in respect of the persons, who have been accused of a non-bailable offence, committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, and if his arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that he is a resident of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, came up for consideration



before a Division Bench of this Court in the case of *S.P.Shanthi Swaroop v. State of*

WEB COPY

Tamil Nadu, rep. By Asst. Commissioner of Police, Central Crime Branch, Madras

reported in 1992 L.W.(CrL.) 475. After elaborate discussion, decisions and

considering the ratio laid down by the Patna High Court in *Syed Safrul Hassan v.*

State, the Division Bench has passed the following order :

“For the foregoing reasons, we hold that the High Court or the Court of Session has got power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. To grant anticipatory bail irrespective of the locale of the Commission of the offence. In other words, in respect of persons who have been accused of a non-bailable offence committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, if their arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that they are residents of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail. However, we wish to observe that while granting anticipatory bail, this Court has to restrict the relief for a limited period and to direct the concerned persons to move the Court which is having jurisdiction over the matter in the meantime and also impose such condition so as to make the petitioner available for interrogation by the concerned police in the meantime. The reference is answered accordingly.”

7. Thereafter, a learned Single Judge of this Court in the case of *P.Thangavelu and others v. State, rep. By the Inspector of Police and other* reported in 2017 (2) MWN (Cr.) 633 has passed the following order :

“9.Thus, it is seen that though in the State of Uttar Pradesh, the provisions of Section 438, Cr.P.C., enabling grant of Anticipatory bail has been deleted, still the Courts have power to grant Inter-State Anticipatory Bail, more particularly taking into



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

account the provisions under Article 21 of the Constitution of India. In the light of the above Judgments and discussions, this Court is of the view that Inter-State Anticipatory Bail can be granted to the petitioner for a limited period to enable them seek appropriate Bail Orders from the concerned Court.

10. Accordingly, Interim Anticipatory Bail is granted to the petitioner herein till 01.08.2016. The petitioners are directed to be enlarged on Bail in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before the Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Each petitioner shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.10,000- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, to the satisfaction of the Respondent-Police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the Magistrate concerned;

(ii) within the said period, ie., before 01.08.2016, the petitioner shall appear before the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and move for Anticipatory Bail before the said Court.

11. This Court makes it very clear that Interim Anticipatory Bail pertaining to Inter-State disputes cannot be sought as a matter of right and it is purely the discretion of the Court in granting the same, considering the facts, circumstances and also the nature of offences. It is also made clear that this order, on being produced, shall be punctually observed and executed by all concerned."



CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

WEB COPY

8. In view of the decisions cited supra, this Court is inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners for a period of one month. Accordingly, interim anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners for a period of one month. The petitioners are directed to be enlarged on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the respondent police and on further conditions that :

(i) the petitioners shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) 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 Judicial Magistrate Court at Paramakudi, Ramanathapuram District;

(ii) within the said period, i.e, before 06.10.2025, the petitioners shall file an appropriate application before the concerned jurisdictional Court for pre-arrest/anticipatory bail.

sd/-
01/09/2025

/ TRUE COPY /

/09/2025
Sub-Assistant Registrar
(C.S. I / II / III / IV)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.



CRL OP(MD) NO. 14308 of 2025

ksa
WEB COPY
TO

- 1 The Judicial Magistrate Court,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram .
- 2 The Judicial 1st Class Magistrate
Special Mobile Court (Excise),
Karimnagar, Telegana State.
- 3 The Inspector of Police,
Karimnagar Women Police Station,
Karimnagar District
Telangana
- 4 The Inspector of Police,
Paramakudi Town Police Station,
Paramakudi,
Ramanathapuram District.
- 5 The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.14308 of 2025
Date :01/09/2025

NM/09.09.2025/ 7P/6C

Madurai Bench of Madras High Court is issuing certified copies in this format from 17/07/2023