



CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 16.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026

K.Shiyamala Priya

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
1. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District

2.Loganayagi
3.Sasikumar
4. Senthilkumar
5. Saravanan

...Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Hariharan
For R-1 : Mr.Mohamed Riyaz
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)
For R-2 to 5 : Mr.K.Hemakarhikeyan

PRAYER :- Petition filed under Sec.483(2)r/w.528 of BNSS to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the respondents 2 to 5 in Cr.M.P.No.7 of 2026 in Crime No.29 of 2025 on the file of the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai, Sivagangai District dated 06.01.2026.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026

This Petition has been filed to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to

the respondents 2 to 5 in Cr.M.P.No.7 of 2026 in Crime No.29 of 2025 on

the file of the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai, Sivagangai

District dated 06.01.2026.

2. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is the defacto complainant in this case and based on the complaint given by her a case has been registered in Crime No.29 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 85,318(2), 296, 316(2), 351(2) of BNS and thereafter the respondents 2 to 5 have approached the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai, Sivagangai District for grant of anticipatory bail in Cr.M.P.No.7 of 2026 and the same was allowed on 06.01.2026 . The offences charges against the respondents 2 to 5 are grave in nature and the first respondent is not the investigation officer and he did not give proper instructions to the Sessions Court and therefore anticipatory bail granted to the respondents 2 to 5 are liable to be cancelled.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the respondents 2 to 5 would submit that the defacto complainant is none other than the wife and daughter -in -law of the second respondent and she lodged complaint as



CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026

against the respondents 2 to 5 with false allegations and thereby a case has been registered in Crime No.29 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 85,318(2), 296, 316(2), 351(2) of BNS. Thereafter the respondents 2 to 5 have approached the Sessions Court for grant of anticipatory bail and the Sessions Court by considering the merits of the petition and considering that the petitioners are living separately granted anticipatory bail to the petitioner and there is no ground to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to the respondents 2 to 5.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent would submit that based on the complaint lodged by the petitioner a case has been registered in Crime No.29 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 85,318(2), 296, 316(2), 351(2) of BNS and thereafter they filed anticipatory bail before the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai, Sivagangai District for grant of anticipatory bail in Cr.M.P.No.7 of 2026 and the same was allowed on 06.01.2026 and thereafter complied with the conditions imposed by the Sessions Court and therefore prayed to pass appropriate orders.

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



CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026

WEB COPY

6. In this case the petitioner is the defacto complainant and based on the complaint given by her a case has been registered in Crime No.29 of 2025 for the offences under Sections 85,318(2), 296, 316(2), 351(2) of BNS and these petitioners have been impleaded as respondents 2 to 5 and thereafter they approached the Sessions Court for grant of anticipatory bail and the learned Sessions Judge after considering that the dispute is between the family members and there is no specific overt act as against the petitioner and the petitioner and the defacto complainant are residing separately granted anticipatory bail and now the petitioner has filed the petition for cancellation of anticipatory bail on the ground that the first respondent is not the investigation officer in this case and he has not given proper instructions to the Court.

7. This Court perused the entire records. The learned Sessions Judge after taking into consideration the facts and circumstances of the case and by affording sufficient reasons granted anticipatory bail and to substantiate the contention of the petitioner that the first respondent is not investigating officer and did not give proper instructions and there are no records and thereby the petition has no merits and deserves to be dismissed.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026

8. Accordingly the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

(P D B J)
16.06.2026

aav

To

1. The Principal Sessions Judge, Sivagangai, Sivagangai District

2. The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station
Karaikudi, Sivagangai District

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 3167 of 2026
P. DHANABAL, J

aav

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 3167 of 2026

Date : 16.06.2026