



CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 29/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

S.Nandhini

... Petitioner/ Accused No.1

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Theni Police Station,
Theni District,
Crime No.141/2025.

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.141/2025 on the file of the
respondent police

For Petitioner : J.Vishnu
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : S.Meena
Advocate.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 316, 318(4), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.141 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the petitioner are the husband and wife. The defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.4,69,000/- to the petitioner through G-Pay. However, the petitioner failed to repay the said amount. When the same was demanded by the defacto complainant, the petitioner along with other accused threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and she was falsely implicated in this case and she has no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that the defacto complainant is a womanizer and he cheated so many women and no previous case is pending against the petitioner. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the defacto complainant is a doctor. Through facebook, they become



CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

lovers and thereafter, got married. After marriage, the defacto complainant came to know that the petitioner married him by suppressing the true facts about her residence, age and job. Further, the petitioner cheated a defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.5 lakhs. After knowing the same, when he questioned the petitioner, she threatened him with dire consequences and the investigation is still pending and the petitioner has 2 previous cases. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. However, he fairly conceded that the petitioner has no previous case.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervenor would submit that the petitioner married the defacto complainant by suppressing the true facts about her residence, age and job. When the same was questioned by the defacto complainant, she threatened him with dire consequences and also through other persons stating that they are District Judges and DSP. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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



CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and there is a dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant in respect of marriage and no previous case is pending against the petitioner, though the petitioner has 2 previous cases, those cases are not a similar kind of offences and the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2024 and FIR was registered only on 11.04.2025 belatedly, 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, Theni**, and on further conditions that:

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

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offences of



CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

similar nature.

WEB COPY

[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.

29.04.2026

dss



CRL OP(MD). No.19818 of 2025

P. DHANABAL,J

dss

To

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

ORDER
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.19818 of 2025

Date : 29/04/2026