



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6480 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 13-03-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN**

**CRL OP No. 6480 of 2026**

1.G. Prasad  
Son of Gopal,  
Residing at,  
Surya Amman Flats,  
No.16 A, Surya Amman Koil Street,  
VOC Nagar, Pammal,  
Chennai-600 075.  
2.P. Srimathy  
Wife of G.Prasad  
both are residing at  
Surya Amman Flats,  
No.16 A, Surya Amman Koil Street,  
VOC Nagar, Pammal,  
Chennai-600 075.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State represented by The Inspector of Police  
All Women Police Station  
Tiruvannamalai  
(Crime No.11 of 2020)

..Respondent(s)

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge me and the second petitioner on bail in the event of our arrest in connection with the case in Crime No.11 of 2020 on the file of the respondent police and pass further suitable orders and thus render justice.

For Petitioner(s):                      Mohamed Ziauddin

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



## **ORDER**

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 498(A) and 506(1) of IPC and 4 of Dowry Prohibition Act, 1961 in Crime No. 11 of 2020, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 developed a love affair with the defacto complainant while she was working in Axis Bank and A1 was employed in TCS. Thereafter, they developed their relationship with the intention of marriage. In the course of the said relationship, A1 induced the defacto complainant and obtained a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- (Rupees Three Lakhs only) from her. Subsequently, the marriage was performed on 04.11.2018 at Marudeeswarar Temple without the consent of their parents. During the said event, photographs were taken through cell phones. Thereafter, A1 and his parents allegedly demanded additional dowry from the defacto complainant for permitting her to enter the matrimonial home. Hence, the law enforcing agency registered a case against the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that though A1 and the defacto complainant were in love, the marriage was not performed in the manner alleged in the FIR. Subsequently, the marriage was proposed to be



fixed. However, certain doubts arose regarding the educational qualification of the defacto complainant and, therefore, the marriage was called off. Even then, without the consent of their parents, the marriage was allegedly performed at Marudeeswarar Temple and a false complaint was given before the law enforcing agency as if A1 and the petitioners had demanded additional dowry for permitting the defacto complainant to enter the matrimonial home. Hence, he prayed for anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submitted that the petitioners had already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court in Criminal O.P. No.3025 of 2021 dated 05.07.2021. Since they did not comply the condition, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent and perused the materials available on record.

6. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), it is seen that this is a case of alleged dowry harassment. However, the FIR was registered on 08.06.2024. At this juncture, the learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that they had already been enlarged on anticipatory bail in Criminal O.P. No.3025 of 2021 dated 05.07.2021. However, at that time, due to



the COVID pandemic, they were not in a position to produce sureties and thereby the application was dismissed. This fact was not seriously disputed by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), and the petitioners have also produced the said order. In view of the above factual position, 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 anticipatory 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 ready, before **the learned Judicial Magistrate, Pallavaram**, 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 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 sign 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.

**13-03-2026**

MPA

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate, Pallavaram.

2. The Inspector of Police  
All Women Police Station  
Tiruvannamalai  
(Crime No.11 of 2020)

3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras,  
Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 6480 of 2



**C.KUMARAPPAN, J.**

**MPA**

**CRL OP No. 6480 of 2026**

**13-03-2026**