



CRL OP(MD). No.17223 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 05.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD) NO. 17223 of 2025

1.Bihar Nisa
2.Monish Basiya
3.Muhamed Shanooj
4.Bazal Malik

..Petitioners

Vs

1.State Of Tamilnadu,
Rep By The Inspector Of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Oddanchatram,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.28 of 2025)

2.Nagananthini Respondent(s)
(R2 is suo motu impleaded
as per order of this Court
dated 27.10.2025.)

For Petitioner(s) :

Mr.Niranjan S.Kumar

For Respondent(s) :

Mr.S.S.Manoj (for R1)
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
Mr.K.Mondila Anand (for R2)



CRL OP(MD). No.17223 of 2025

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

WEB COPY

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.28 of 2025 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 69 and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.28 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and A1 were in a 'live-in' relationship at Bangalore without being married. Thereafter, the first petitioner/A3 herein, mother of A1 refused to accept the relationship and all other accused persons were threatened the defacto complainant and insisted to end up the relationship with A1. Hence, a case was registered.



CRL OP(MD). No.17223 of 2025

WEB COPY 3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He, however, submitted that the petitioners are willing to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) submitted that A1 promised to marry the defacto complainant and due to their 'live-in' relationship, the defacto complainant became pregnant and due to the insistence of A1, she underwent abortion and the investigation is going on. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No.17223 of 2025

5.This Court had already granted anticipatory bail to the petitioners 2 to 4.

6.Taking into consideration of the facts and circumstances of the case and the mother prevented A1 to marry the defacto complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the first petitioner.

7.Accordingly, this petition is dismissed in respect of the first petitioner.

05.11.2025

vsg



CRL OP(MD). No.17223 of 2025

WEB COPY

To

1.The learned Judicial Magistrate,
Oddanchathiram, Dindigul District.

2. The Inspector Of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Oddanchatram,
Dindigul District.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.17223 of 2025

S. SRIMATHY. J. ,

vsg

Cr1.O.P. (MD) .No.17223 of 2025

Date : 05.11.2025