



CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 09/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

1. S. Ponnuthurai
2. P. Sivathanu
3. D. Babyusha
4. B. Dinesh ... Petitioners/ Accused No.1 to 4

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kanyakumari District
(Crime No. 47 of 2025). ... Respondent/ Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 47 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police...

For Petitioners : M/s. Pinaygash.I.,
Advocate.

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

For Intervener : Mr.K.Sudalaiyandi

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 498(A), 406, 294(b) and 506(1) of IPC Act (Corresponding Offences 85, 316(2), 296(b) and 351(3) of BNS) and Section 3(1) and 4 of the Dowry Prohibition Act, in Crime No.47 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner is the husband and the petitioners 2 to 4 are the in-laws. At the time of marriage, the defacto complainant was given 150 sovereigns of gold jewels, household articles worth about Rs.5,00,000/- and cash amount of Rs.5,00,000/- as sridhana. After marriage, the petitioners herein are said to have harassed the defacto complainant by demanding a sum of Rs.50 lakh as additional dowry for running business. Hence, a case has been registered against the accused for the aforesaid offences. Hence, this petition.

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



CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that the it is a matrimonial dispute between A1 and the defacto complainant and no previous cases is pending against the petitioners. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that it is a matrimonial dispute. Due to infertility, the petitioners harassed the defacto complainant by demanding additional dowry. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail. However, he fairly conceded that no previous case is pending against the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervener would submit that there are serious allegations as against the petitioners. The first petitioner is used to consume liquor and made quarrel with the defacto complainant without going to any job and the petitioners 2 to 5 mortgaged the 42 sovereigns of the gold jewels of the complainant and used that amount to construct house for the the petitioners 4 & 5. Hence, he prayed for dismissal of this petition.



CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

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 it is a matrimonial dispute between the parties and the relationship between the parties and there is no previous cases as 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) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the Additional Mahila Court, Nagercoil, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, 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.



CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

[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 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)
09.04.2026
2/2

dss



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.23577 of 2025

P. DHANABAL,J

DSS

To

- 1.The Additional Mahila Court,
Nagercoil.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Kanyakumari District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.23577 of 2025

Date : 09/04/2026
2/2