



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.646 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10.02.2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD)No.646 of 2026

1.M.Andivel
2.Sumathi
3.A.Govindaraj

... Petitioners

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Eriodu Police Station,
Dindigul city.
(Crime No.304 of 2025)

... Respondent

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Vignesh

For Respondent : Mr.S.S.Manoj
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : Mr.M.Sankar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.304 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.646 of 2026

ORDER: The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 318(4), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS and 4 of TNPHW Act in Crime No.304 of 2025, in Crime No.304 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the 1st petitioner were in a live-in relationship, during which the 1st petitioner received money from the defacto complainant. On 21.11.2024, when the defacto complainant demanded repayment, a quarrel ensued. The petitioners refused to return the money and instead, assaulted and criminally intimidated the defacto complainant. Hence, the apprehension of arrest. Hence, a case has been registered as against the petitioners.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the 1st petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence. He further submitted that this Court has already granted anticipatory bail to the petitioners 2 and 3 and he seeks this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.646 of 2026

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent submitted that the first petitioner had received an amount from the defacto complainant, and when the defacto complainant demanded repayment, a wordy quarrel arose between them. He further submitted that the first petitioner had produced a bogus identity card as though it had been issued by the Bank and thereby cheated the defacto complainant.

5.Considering the serious nature of allegations made against the petitioner that he had used a bogus identity card, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the 1st petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as against the 1st petitioner.

10.02.2026

trp



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.646 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY,J

trp

TO

1.The Inspector of Police,
Eriodu Police Station,
Dindigul city.

2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.646 of 2026

Date : 10.02.2026