



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No.8931 of 2026

R Yamini
D/o. Ravi,
No.22/17, Thanakotti Nagar,
Periyar Nagar,
Thiruninravur,
Chennai 602 024.

...Petitioner/A2

Vs

State by;
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Thiruninravur Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.
Cr.No. 443/2025.

...Respondent/
Complainant

Prayer: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of her arrest, pending investigation in Crime No.443/2025 on the file of the Thirunindravur Police Station, Tiruvallur District.

For Petitioner :

Mr. D.Ashokkumar

For Respondent:

Mr.P.Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

Mr.A.Jothagwaran
for Intervenor



ORDER

The petitioner/A2, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offences under Sections 296(b), 329(4) and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, and under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 2002, in Crime No.443 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that due to previous enmity, the petitioner and others unlawfully entered into the *de-facto* complainant's house and threatened the *de-facto* complainant and her husband with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A1 submitted that the petitioner is innocent and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the *de facto complainant*, and she has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submitted that the alleged occurrence took place on 16.04.2025 and that the petitioner is a woman and she is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court and she is ready to cooperate for the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution's case and, upon instructions, submitted that the petitioner/A2 was in a relationship with the *de-facto* complainant's son and, thereafter, they separated; and that in furtherance, this petitioner/A2, along with other persons, entered into the *de-facto* complainant's residence and has abused them. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) as well as the learned counsel for the intervenor and perused the materials available on record.

6. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 would submit that the occurrence took place on 16.04.2025. It is the submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) that the petitioner/A2 was in a relationship with the *de-facto* complainant's son, and thereafter, they have separated. In furtherance, this petitioner/A2, along with other persons, entered into the *de-facto* complainant's residence and has abused them. According to the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) there are no injuries to anyone.



7. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), this Court could not find any serious allegation against the petitioner except trespassing into the *de-facto* complainant's residence and abusing the occupant of the house. Hence, taking into consideration of the fact that the FIR was registered on 16.04.2025, at this length of time, no custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required. Therefore, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy is made ready, before the **learned Judicial Magistrate – II, Tiruvallur**, on condition that **the petitioner 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 petitioner 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



WEB COPY



proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent police, twice a day at 10.30 a.m., and 5.30 p.m., for a period of one week and thereafter, as and when required for the 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 petitioner 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.

09-04-2026

dk

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate – II,
Tiruvallur.
2. The Sub Inspector of Police
Thiruninravur Police Station,
Tiruvallur District.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No.8931 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.
dk

CRL OP No. 8931 of 2026

09-04-2026