



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.859 of 2026

E.Sathya

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruvallur District
(Crime No.21 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in connection with the Crime No.21 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Ilayaraja

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 316(2), 318(2), 351 (2) & 85 of BNS (Sections 294(b), 406, 417, 506(1) & 498 (A) of IPC) & Sections 4 of DP Act, in Crime No. 21 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The petitioner herein claimed himself as Sub Registrar in the Registration Department, convinced the defacto complainant and married her. Subsequently, he harassed her and also demanded gold jewels on various pretexts, leading to lodging of a complaint and registration of an FIR.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the co-accused has already been released on anticipatory bail and also the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition imposed by this court and hence he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Earlier this court has dismissed the bail petition of the petitioner in CrI.OP.No.30319 of 2025 vide order dated 07.11.2025 on the following reason:



WEB COPY



“6. Taking all the factors into consideration and in view of the fact that the majority of the allegations are against the first petitioner and there is no change in circumstances, I am not inclined to consider the anticipatory bail petition of the first petitioner. “

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, nature of allegations, and the submissions made by learned counsels on either side, and that while granting anticipatory bail to the co-accused, this court has specifically observed that the petitioner is having specific overtact in the offence and hence he is not entitled to anticipatory bail and since there is no change in circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

12.01.2026

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thiruvallur District

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

3/4



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

gv

Crl.O.P.No.859 of 2026

12.01.2026