



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6810 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 07.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 6810 of 2026

G.Ramaraj

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Rural All Women Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.34 of 2025)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Mohamed Haneef
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.M.Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

For Intervenor : Mr.R.Velmurugan

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 34 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

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 and 351(2) of BNS, in Crime No.34



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6810 of 2026

of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the petitioner are husband and wife. It is alleged that the petitioner along with other accused demanded additional dowry from the defacto complainant and harassed her. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the 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. It is a matrimonial dispute between the parties. The co-accused in this case have been already granted anticipatory bail. The petitioner is ready to live with the defacto complainant and HMOP is also pending for restitution of conjugal rights. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) fairly submits that the offence is grave in nature. The petitioner along with other accused persons made dowry harassment to the defacto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. However, the petitioner has no previous case. Co-accused were already released on anticipatory bail by



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6810 of 2026

this Court. Investigation is still pending.

WEB COPY

5.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor strongly objected the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, stating that the petitioner has committed serious offence and the earlier application has been filed by all the accused persons. Considering the seriousness of offence only, the earlier application has been dismissed by this Court, while granting anticipatory bail to others. He also seeks adjournment for filing intervening application.

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 petitioner and there is matrimonial dispute between the parties, now the petitioner is ready to live with the defacto complainant, co-accused in this case have been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, the petitioner has no previous case and also considering the other facts and circumstances of the 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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6810 of 2026

Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul and on further conditions that:

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

[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.



WEB COPY
TM



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6810 of 2026

(P D B J)
07.04.2026

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.III, Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Rural All Women Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.34 of 2025)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6810 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 6810 of 2026

Date : 07.04.2026