



CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 24.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

1.Murugesan
2.Sangeshwari

...Petitioners/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Thirumangalam All Women Police Station
Madurai District.
(Crime No. 24 of 2025)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.C.Madhavan
Advocate.

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

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 24 of 2025 on the file of the
respondent police.

1/6



CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A1 & A2, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 406, 294(b) and 506(i) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023, in Crime No. 24 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and A1 is the wife and the husband. From the date of marriage, the petitioners and other accused demanded three sovereigns of gold jewels and physically assaulted the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submits that A3 and A4 were already released on bail and the second petitioner/A2 was already granted interim anticipatory bail. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) fairly submits that the defacto complainant and accused person were the same family members and due to family dispute, the occurrence happened and no previous case is pending as against the petitioners. However, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

6. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, and the relationship between the parties and also considering the facts that no previous case is pending against the petitioners and co-accused were already released on bail and A2 was also granted interim anticipatory bail, 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 for the first petitioner/A1 to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties for a like sum



CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

WEB COPY

to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Thirumangalam, Madurai, and as far as the second petitioner/A2 is concerned, since already interim anticipatory bail was granted to her and sureties were also produced, the second petitioner/A2 need not be produce sureties and the same sureties shall be extended to the present anticipatory bail and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners 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 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



CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

WEB COPY

law as if 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)
24.03.2026

apd

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate, Thirumangalam, Madurai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Thirumangalam All Women Police Station
Madurai District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 18696 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 18696 of 2025

Date : 24.03.2026