



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 01.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

Sathiskumar

...Petitioner/Accused -1

Vs

1. State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
AWPS, Sivagangai
(Crime No. 2 of 2026)

2. Shiyamala Priya

...Respondents

*(R2 is suo motu impleaded vide order dated 09.01.2026
in Crl.O.P.(MD) No.430 of 2026)*

For Petitioner : Mr.K.R.Bharathi Kannan
Advocate.

For R-1 : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R-2 : Mr.S.Saravana Kumar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 2 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 85, 318(2), 296, 316(2) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No. 2 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and the defacato complainant are the husband and wife. After marriage, the defacto complainant was demanded additional dowry of Rs.15,00,000/- which was given by the defacto complainant's mother. Thereafter, the defacto complainant came to know that the petitioner is having illegal relationship with two others, which was questioned by the defacto complainant, the petitioner and his family members scolded her with filthy language and threatened her with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected in the above said incident. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that co-accused were granted anticipatory bail and a part of the articles were handed over to the defacto complainant. Hence, he prayed to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 85, 318(2), 296, 316(2) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No. 2 of 2026 . He would further submit that the petitioner has no previous case and a part of articles were also exchanged between the parties. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor would reiterate the submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) and strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

WEB COPY

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and considering the relationship between the parties and considering the facts that there is a family dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant, already co-accused were granted anticipatory bail by this Court and already a part of articles were exchanged between the parties and the petitioner has no previous case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judge, Additional Mahila Court, Sivagangai, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police, on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of four weeks, and thereafter as and when required for the



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

interrogation.

WEB COPY

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

apd

(P D B J)
01.06.2026
(3/3)



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Judge, Additional Mahila Court, Sivagangai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
AWPS, Sivagangai.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 430 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 430 of 2026

Date : 01.06.2026
(3/3)