

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Date: Monday, the 29th day of June 2026

Crl.M.P. No.1870 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003817-2026)

1. Muniraj, aged 66 years, S/o.Muthukkan,
residing at: No.528, Malkapoor, Thandarampet Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai District.
2. Rajeswari, aged 53 years, W/o.Muniraj,
residing at: No.31, Muniyappan Nagar 1st Street,
Nerkunam, Tiruvallur.
3. Kadavul, aged 37 years, S/o.Muniraj,
residing at: No.528, Sengal Medu, Beemarapettai,
Chengam, Tnandarampet Taluk,
Tiruvannamalai District.
4. Anju, aged 33 years, W/o. Kadavul,
residing at: No.528, Sengal Medu, Beemarapatti,
Chengam, Thandarampet Taluk,
Nerkunam, Tiruvallur.

.. Petitioners/accused

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Selaiyur Police Station

Cr. No.281 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.296(b), 115(2), 316(2), 318(4) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023.

// and //

S.Vignesh, S/o.Suryaprakash

.. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in CMP No.1976 of 2026

This petition for anticipatory bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.K.Anbarasu, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioners/accused, M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor is

appearing for the respondent/complainant and of M/s.G.Daisy John, the learned counsel is appearing for the intervenor/defacto complainant, upon hearing the respective sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following:

ORDER

The petition in Crl.M.P. No.1870 of 2026 is filed by the petitioners/accused U/s.482 of B.N.S.S. to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail, whereas the petition in Crl.M.P. No.1976 of 2026 is filed by the defacto complainant/intervenor in order to object the anticipatory bail application.

2. The petitioners/accused apprehends arrest at the hands of respondent police in connection with Cr. No.281 of 2026 for the alleged offences U/s.296(b), 115(2), 316(2), 318(4) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply received. Heard both sides; records perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that, the defacto complainant and one Revathi were loved together and got married during the year 2020 and they have blessed with a male child. On 21.09.2025, the defacto complainant's wife died, due to her illness. Pursuant to that, on the pretext of performing her final rites and rituals at her native place at Tiruvannamalai, the petitioners - who are the family members of the deceased Revathi, took her 70 sovereigns of gold jewels, silver articles and other household articles with them. After completing her final rites, when the defacto complainant asked to return the jewels and other articles, the accused have not only refused but also threatened him with dire consequences. Thereby, a case has been registered in Cr. No.281 of 2026 on the file of respondent police station.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners/accused would submit that the petitioners/accused are innocent of offence, they are falsely implicated in this case; the deceased Revathy is a doctor and she running a clinic, thereby she substantially earned; but the defacto complainant is a jobless person; the disputed jewels and articles were purchased out of the earnings of the deceased Revathy; moreover, at the time of demise of the said Revathy, the bureau (almirah) key is on possession of the defacto complainant; the petitioners are the illiterate persons hails from a village; while so, the allegations that the petitioners have took the jewels and other articles are utter false; moreover, the investigating officer had made a house search at the petitioners' residence at Chennai and Tiruvannamalai, however nothing has been recovered during the search which revealed the allegations raised by the defacto complainant is false; moreover, the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon them and they are ready to offer substantial sureties before the court, thereby praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, re-iterated the prosecution version and objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. The learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant made her arguments canvassing that at the time of their marriage, the deceased (*wife of defacto complainant*) is MBBS student and the defacto complainant only supported to continue her education. Moreover, he financially assisted her family members by purchasing an auto rickshaw and livestock for her brother - 4th accused. Further, the defacto complainant spend approximately Rs.46,50,400/- to construct a house on land belonging to his wife's family

by raising funds through banking transactions. Even at the time of fell into ill of his wife Revathi, the petitioners came to the defacto complainant's house and deliberately stole 70 sovereigns of gold jewels and other articles. The accused have also took his infant child in order to blackmail him. Pursuant to the complaint, the infant child has been recovered. Later another complaint has been given in order to recover the stolen jewels, for which CSR No.2507 of 2025 has been registered. Further, the defacto complainant filed a petition in W.P. (Crl) No.401 of 2026 before the Hon'ble High Court, Madras, in which, the Investigating Officer filed a status report. In Para No.9 of the status report, the Investigating officer admitt that '*with regard to the gold jewels, they (the family members of the deceased) stated during the enquiry that the jewels were purchased out of her own earnings, and the Vignesh (defacto complainant) has no connection or claim over the said jewels*'. Therefore, the theft of jewels is confirmed and still the jewels are under the custody of the petitioners/accused and hence, she objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Upon hearing both sides, this court directed the investigating officer to file a status report of this case. Accordingly, today, the learned Public Prosecutor filed the status report of the investigating officer. In the said status report, the investigating officer stated that, during the house search conducted by him at the petitioners' house at Chennai and Tiruvannamalai, no jewels or articles were found place.

9. The status report filed by the Investigating Officer has been perused and recorded. On perusal of the records and from the submissions, it appears the dispute seemed to be the matrimonial dispute. Under such circumstances, this court is of the considered view that the custody of the

present petitioners for the purpose of investigation is dispensable. More so, if the defacto complainant has any grievance regarding the return of jewels / articles, he ought to have approached the competent civil forum. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioners and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

10. In the result, Crl.M.P. No.1870 of 2026 is allowed; The intervenor petition in C.M.P. No.1976 of 2026 is closed, accordingly. Anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioners/accused with the following conditions.

1. The Petitioners, in the event of arrest or their surrender before the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram within 15 days, are ordered to be released on bail on their execution of bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram;
2. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce copy of any identify proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity;
3. The petitioners are directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for 15 days;
4. The petitioners shall not tamper with the witnesses or hamper the investigation in any manner;
5. The Petitioners should comply with the conditions contemplated u/s.482 (2)(i), (ii) and (iii) of B.N.S.S.;
6. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take

appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself in accordance with the decision ***AIR 2006 S.C. 100 – P.K. Shaji vs State of Kerala.***

Pronounced by me in the open court, on this the 29th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tambaram.
The Inspector of Police, Selaiyur Police Station