



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.5569 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 04.03.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.5569 of 2026

1.V.Rajendran
2.Rajapushpaladha

... Petitioners

Vs.

State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Pudupettai Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
(Crime No. 62 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 in Crime No.62 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Selvakumar

For Respondent : Mr. P. Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 294(b), 506(i) and 406 IPC in Crime No.62 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners are arrayed as A2 and A3 in this case and they are the father-in-law and mother-in-law of the defacto complainant. It is alleged that due to matrimonial discord between the son of the petitioners and the defacto complainant, the present complaint has been lodged and a case has been registered against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that after the filing of HMOP.No.124 of 2025 by the first petitioner, the present complaint was lodged by the defacto complainant alleging that the accused have not returned the sridhana properties. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the petitioners have no previous case against them and that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. I have given my anxious consideration to either side submissions and perused the materials available on record.



6. Even according to the allegations made in the FIR, the grievance against the petitioners is that they have not returned the sridhana properties.

However, considering the age of the petitioners, the first petitioner is aged about 72 years and the second petitioner about 55 years, and that except for the issue relating to sridhana properties, there are no other specific allegations against the petitioners. In such a view of the position and also taking into consideration the age and gender of the first and second petitioners respectively, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

7. 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 is made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Panruti, Cuddalore District** on condition that **the petitioners shall execute a separate 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



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.5569 c



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 10.30 a.m., for a period of one week 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 petitioner 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 petitioner thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

04.03.2026

DRL

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II,
Panruti, Cuddalore District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Pudupettai Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

4/5



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.5569 of 2026



C.KUMARAPPAN.J.

DRL

Crl.OP.No.5569 of 2026

04.03.2026