



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.902 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 16.02.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD). No.902 of 2026

1.Satheeshkumar

2.Jegadeeshkumar

3.Hemalatah

4.Divyabharathi

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu,

Rep. by the Inspector of Police,

Viruveedu Police Station,

Viruveedu

Dindigul District.

(Crime No.5 of 2026)

... Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Jeganathan

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

For Intervenor : Mr.Vihru

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.5 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent Police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 329(2), 296(b), 118(1),



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.902 of 2026

351(3), 303(1)(NP) of BNS and Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Women Harassment Act in Crime No.5 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners 1 and 2 are the sons of first wife of Jeya prakash and defacto complainant is the daughter of the second wife of Jeyaprakash and there existed family dispute between them. The petitioners 3 and 4 are the wives of the petitioners 1 and 2. In the said circumstance, the said Jeyaprakash had died on 06.12.2025. On 10.01.2026 the petitioners engaged in harvesting coconuts from the coconut trees wherein the defacto complainant had questioned the same leading to quarrel whereby the petitioners attacked her, threatened her with dire consequence and also used filthy language. Hence, a case has been registered.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they have not committed any offence. He seeks this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) strongly opposed



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.902 of 2026

to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. When the petition was taken up for hearing, the learned Counsel appearing for the petitioners sought the permission of this Court to withdraw the petition as far as the petitioners 1 and 2 are concerned and has also made an endorsement to that effect.

6. In view of the above said submission, the criminal original petition is dismissed as withdrawn, as far as the petitioners 1 and 2 are concerned.

7. This case was referred to mediation and it is reported that the mediation failed. Therefore, taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case, the nature and gravity of the offence and the specific overt act against the petitioners 3 and 4, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 3 and 4 at this stage.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed, as far as the petitioners 3 and 4 are concerned.

TMG

3/5

16.02.2026
(1/2)



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.902 of 2026

1.The Inspector of Police,
Viruvedu Police Station,
Viruvedu
Dindigul District.

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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.902 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

TMG

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.902 of 2026

Date : 16.02.2026
(1/2)