



WEB COPY



CrI.OP.No.2915 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.2915 of 2026

1. Rajkumar
2. Murugammal
3. Anandkumar

... Petitioners

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
Kandili Police Station,
Thirupathur District.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on bail, in the event of their arrest, in Cr.No.44 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.S.Siddharth

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (CrI.side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 296(b), 126(2), 318(2) and 79 of BNS r/w Section 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act,1981 in Cr.No.44 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner has closely moved with the victim/defacto complainant in this case and promised to marry her and had physical relationship, subsequently he was demanded her to convert in to his religion (Christianity). Accordingly, she was converted into petitioner's religion. Thereafter harassed her status stated that she has not paid sufficient dowry and refused to marry her, which lead to the registration of the case. Hence, the present petition for anticipatory bail.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the the petitioners herein are ranked as A1, A3 and A4; that it is a false accusation. He further submitted that the first petitioner is ready to marry the victim and live with her. However, the victim girl has refused to marry him. He also submitted that the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the investigation in this case is pending . Hence, he vehemently opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



5. I have also gone through the FIR and other connected materials, which revealed that the petitioner after co-operating to the extent of fixing the marriage, withdrawn from the marriage. However, considering the nature of offence and this Court is of the view that investigate the case of this nature, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not necessary. Hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

6. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned ***Judicial Magistrate-II, Thirupathur District*** on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute separate bonds for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice,



2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioners shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30a.m., for a period of four weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]***;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

09.02.2026

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-II, Thirupathur District
2. The Inspector of Police,
Kandili Police Station,
Thirupathur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.2915 of 2026

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.2915 of 2026

09.02.2026