



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 30.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

Thangapandian

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CBCID Police Station,
Nagercoil
Kanyakumari.
(Crime No. 2 of 2021)

...Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.Kathirvelu
Senior Counsel
for Mr.K.Prabhu
Advocate.

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

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 2 of 2021 on the file of the respondent

1/7



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

police.

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 377, 294(b), 254A, 323 and 506(ii) of IPC and Section 67A of IT Act, 2000 @ Sections 417, 354(A), 354(B), 354C, 354D, 376, 323, 324, 294(b), 506(i) and 201 of IPC and Section 4 of THPHW Act and Sections 66E, 67, 67A of IT Act, 2000 in Crime No. 2 of 2021 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 and the defacto complainant have acquaintance through social media. By making false marriage promise, the A1 had sexual intercourse with the defacto complainant and without her knowledge, recorded a video. By threatening her, A1 got money from the defacto complainant and taking advantage of the same, A2, who is the friend of A1, has also molested the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

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. He would further submit that the petitioner is none other than the father of A1 and there is no specific over-act attributed as against this petitioner. Hence, he prayed to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 376, 377, 294(b), 254A, 323 and 506(ii) of IPC and Section 67A of IT Act, 2000 @ Sections 417, 354(A), 354(B), 354C, 354D, 376, 323, 324, 294(b), 506(i) and 201 of IPC and Section 4 of THPHW Act and Sections 66E, 67, 67A of IT Act, 2000 in Crime No. 2 of 2021. He would further submit that the petitioner has some previous cases, which are not similar in nature. He would further submit that the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

6. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and considering the facts that as per prosecution, the main allegation is as against A1 and this petitioner is none other than the father of A1 and the alleged occurrence took place on 07.06.2019 and however, FIR has been registered on 06.01.2021 and by this time, investigation might have been completed and though the petitioner has some previous cases, the same are not similar in nature and in all cases, bail was granted to the petitioner, 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 Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate -I, Nagercoil, and on further conditions that:

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



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

interrogation.

WEB COPY

[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.

(P D B J)
30.04.2026

apd

5/7



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate -I, Nagercoil.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
CBCID Police Station,
Nagercoil
Kanyakumari.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 8882 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 8882 of 2026

Date : 30.04.2026