



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 26.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP (MD) . No. 5920 of 2026

1.Saranya

2.Mariyappan

3.Seethalakshmi

..Petitioners/A2 to A4

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thoothukudi,
Thoothukudi District.
(Crime No.22 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners:Mr.A.Karthik
Advocate.

For Respondent :Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervener :Mr.M.B.Siva Sankar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482
of BNSS



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.22 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A2 to A4, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 342, 294(b), 506(i) of IPC and Section 4 of TNPHW Act, 2002, in Crime No.22 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the wife of the A1. The petitioners are in-laws of the defacto complainant. The marriage between A1 and the defacto complainant was solemnized on 06.04.2015. At the time of marriage, the parents of the defacto complainant gave 15 sovereign of gold jewels, cash of Rs.3 lakhs for marriage expenses



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

as dowry. Out of their wedlock, she was blessed with two sons. From the date of marriage, A1 and her in-laws demanded additional dowry. Thereafter, A1 and the first petitioner used to speak over phone in the night hours and developed an illegal intimacy. When the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, the petitioners and other accused persons assaulted her and locked her in the room without providing food and water. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that due to family dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant, the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case. He would further submit that the petitioners are innocent persons and they are no way connected in the above said incident. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor represented the defacto complainant and would submit that the defacto complainant is going to file intervene petition. He would further submit that the first accused had illegal relationship with the first petitioner/A2 and thereby, the second accused threatened the defacto complainant and the petitioners 3 and 4 are parents of the second accused. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent Police would submit that the first petitioner had illegal relationship with A1, who is the husband of the defacto complainant and hence, the present has been filed against them. He fairly submits that the petitioners have no previous cases. However, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

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

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners and there was a matrimonial dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant and the petitioners are not related to A1 and also considering the fact that no previous cases pending against the petitioners, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV,



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

WEB COPY

Thoothukudi, and on further conditions

that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police once in a week ie., on Every Saturday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of four weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation.

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

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

[e] the petitioners 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

WEB COPY

the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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.

(P D B J)

26.03.2026

vsg

To

- 1.The learned Judicial Magistrate No.IV,
Thoothukudi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Thoothukudi,
Thoothukudi District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 5920 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.,

vsg

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No. 5920 of 2026

Date : 26.03.2026