Order QR

WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 29-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.RAMESH

CRL OP No.31361 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA012576032026}

E Anandan ..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep by The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station,
Taramani,
Chennai District.
Crime no.26 of 2026.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Connection with in Crime no.26 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Appaswamee VR

For Intervenor: Mr.V.Karthikeyan

For Respondent(s): Mr. R.Rajasekaran Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

ORDER

The petitioner, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent Police for the alleged offences punishable under Section 69 of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.26 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.This is the second anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner, and the earlier petition was dismissed on 23.10.2026. The prosecution case is that the petitioner developed a relationship with the victim, promised to marry her, had sexual intercourse with her and subsequently refused to marry her.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent; that he has been falsely implicated in this case; that it is a case of love affair; that the victim had consensual relationship with the petitioner and since further custody of the petitioner is not required for the purpose of investigation and he sought for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail, submitting that the petitioner had intentionally deceived the victim by giving a false promise of marriage solely to extract her consent for sexual intercourse. It was further submitted that the victim, who is a married woman with a child, was exploited by the petitioner under the guise of a

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

relationship, and his subsequent refusal to marry her squarely attracts the offences under Section 69 of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023. The learned counsel emphasized that this is a successive application filed shortly after the dismissal of the earlier petition on 23.10.2026, without any change in circumstances. It was also argued that the petitioner's claim of being unaware of the victim's marital status and child is completely false and a mere afterthought to escape criminal liability, and therefore, urged this Court to reject the anticipatory bail application.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police opposed the grant of anticipatory bail by reiterating the prosecution case. It was submitted that though the petitioner and the defacto complainant were in a consensual relationship, the petitioner subsequently refused to marry her.

6.The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that the petitioner was unaware of the fact that the victim was already married and had a child. However, this Court is of the view that a person having a physical relationship with a woman would certainly be aware of whether she is married and has a child. Therefore, the reason stated by the petitioner is not convincing and cannot be accepted.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this Court is not inclined to grant relief of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8.Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

29-10-2026

GBI

To

1.The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station,
Taramani,
Chennai District.

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

N.RAMESH, J.

GBI

CRL OP No. 31361 of 2026

29-10-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis