



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9864 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 20-04-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 9864 of 2026

1.Arumugam
2.Perumal
3.Eswari

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Represented by
Inspector of Police,
Jolarpet Police Station,
Tirupathur District.
(Crime No.87 of 2026)

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, to enlarge the Petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest by the respondent police concerned in Crime No. 87 of 2026 on the file of the respondent, on such terms and conditions and as this Court.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.R.Parthiban

For Respondent(s):

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

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 115(2) and 85 of the



Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, in Crime No.87 of 2026, seek anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. According to the prosecution, the petitioners allegedly demanded dowry from the daughter of the defacto complainant. It is further alleged that during these demands, they subjected her to physical and mental harassment, used obscene language, and threatened her with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that this is essentially a matrimonial dispute between the first petitioner and the daughter of the defacto complainant. He contends that she is a person of an impulsive nature and was prone to initiating verbal altercations due to her temperament. He further submits that the daughter of the defacto complainant consumed sleeping pills of her own accord, following which the petitioners immediately admitted her to the hospital for medical treatment. He contends that the petitioners have not committed any of the alleged offences and that, in any event, custodial interrogation is not required for the purpose of the investigation.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing on behalf of the respondent police, while opposing the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, reiterated the prosecution case and on instructions submitted that the petitioners demanded dowry for the purchase of a car, which led to a dispute resulting in the victim consuming sleeping pills. He further noted that the petitioner has no bad antecedents and that she has been discharged from the hospital.

5. Considering the nature of the allegations and the fact that the petitioners have no prior bad antecedents, and taking note of the submission that the dispute relates to matrimonial issue and the victim has already been discharged from the hospital, and since custodial interrogation is not deemed necessary for the purpose of investigation, this Court is 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 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 No.I, Tirupattur, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) each, with two sureties each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further conditions:



(a) If the petitioner(s) 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 petitioner(s) shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;

(d) the petitioner(s) shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(e) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner(s) in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner(s) 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];

(f) If the petitioner(s) thereafter absconds, a fresh

FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

20-04-2026

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Jeni

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tirupattur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police, Jolarpet Police Station, Tirupathur District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 9864 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Jeni

CRL OP No. 9864 of 2026

20-04-2026