



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.5144 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.5144 of 2026

1.Sugumar
2.Kathirvelu
3.Rajeshwari
4.Suganya @ Deepa
5.Latha

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Katpadi Police Station,
Vellore District.
(Crime No.03 of 2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of arrest pending investigation in Crime No.03 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.Vijayasankar
For Respondent : Ms.R.Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehends arrest for the alleged offence **under Sections 85, 318(2) of BNS read with Section 4 of DP Act in Crime No.03 of 2026** on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioners is that 1st petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant and other petitioners are in-laws and that they had harassed the defacto complainant by demanding more dowry. Hence, a case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the first petitioner lived with the defacto complainant only for 45 days and even according to the FIR, the occurrence took place during the year 2024, however FIR came to be registered only in the year 2026. He further submitted that, petitioner never demanded dowry and the 1st petitioner is the husband of the defacto complainant and the 2nd & 3rd petitioners are father and mother of the 1st petitioner and 4th & 5th petitioners are sisters of the 1st petitioner and that they are no way connected with the matrimonial discord between the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant, however they have been wrongly roped in this case. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, upon instructions,



submitted that it is a dowry prohibition case and the investigation in this case is pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. While looking at the copy of the FIR, there is a reference that the occurrence of the offence is from 22.08.2024 and since it is a matrimonial dispute, I am of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not necessary and apart from that, petitioners 2 to 5 are relatives to the 1st petitioner and no way connected with the matrimonial discord between the 1st petitioner and the defacto complainant. In view of such position, this Court deems fit that the petitioners may be granted anticipatory bail subject to certain conditions.

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

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned learned 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 1st petitioner shall report before the respondent police twice daily at 10.30.a.m., and 05.30.p.m., for a period of four weeks and at 10.30.a.m., for a period of two weeks thereafter, as and when required for interrogation; the petitioners (2 to 5) shall report before the respondent police 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 petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

02.03.2026

sma



To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court, Katpadi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Katpadi Police Station,
Vellore District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.5144 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN.J.

sma

Crl.OP.No.5144 of 2026

02.03.2026