

TNMD010018482026



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : THIRU. M.SAISARAVANAN., M.L.,

Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Wednesday, this the 10th day of June, 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.1141/2026

CNR No.TNMD010018482026

1. G.Naveen, S/o. Gunasekaran,

2. T.Thamizhchelvi, W/o. S.Gunasekaran,

3. S.Gunasekaran, S/o. Subramanian

... Petitioners/Accused.

Vs

Aarthika Shree, W/o.Naveen

...Intervene Petitioner.

State through the Inspector of Police,

Anna Nagar AWP.S. in Cr.No.04/2026

... Respondent/Complainant.

This e-petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.M.Gingston, Advocate for the petitioners, Thiru.A.Sarankumar, Advocate for the intervene petitioner, and of Public Prosecutor for the State, this court passed the following:

Order

1. Anticipatory bail application u/s 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023.

2. The defacto-complainant/intervening petitioner has filed an intervening petition and he is permitted to assist the public prosecutor.

3. Heard both.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioners/A1 to A3 would submit that the respondent police registered a case against the petitioners and another in Cr.No.4/2026 for the offences u/s. 498(A), 406, 294(b) of IPC and Sec.4 of TNPWH Act. The petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offences as alleged. The 1st petitioner and the defacto-complainant are husband and wife. The petitioners 2 and 3 are in-laws of the defacto-complainant. The petitioners never demanded dowry from the defacto-complainant. The defacto-

complainant voluntarily left the matrimonial home. The 1st petitioner filed HMOP.No.381/2026 on the file of Family Court, Madurai seeking divorce and the same is pending. Thereafter, the defacto-complainant lodged the present false complaint against the petitioners. A4 is working in Abroad and he has been falsely implicated in this case. The respondent police issued summons to the petitioners and they appeared for enquiry properly. The petitioners have not filed similar petition before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court or any other court. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of police and they are ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this court and prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners. He filed copy of photos of the 1st petitioner along with the defacto-complainant, copy of Air ticket for Honey Moon trip, copy of petition filed in HMOP.No.381/2026, copy of Travel History of A4 and copy of the registration certificate of the Innova car, which was gifted to the defacto-complainant by her parents and is registered in the name of Karthikeya Brabhu, the brother of the defacto-complainant.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that totally there are 4 accused persons in this case and the petitioners are A1 to A3. As per the case of the prosecution, A1 is the husband of the defacto-complainant. A2 and A3 are parents of A1. A4 is the brother of A1. The marriage between the defacto-complainant and A1 has taken place on 01.11.2023. At the time of their marriage, 600 sovereign of jewels, cash Rs.25 Lacs, Innova car and Sridhana articles were presented to the couple by the parents of the defacto-complainant. After marriage, all were living under one roof as joint family. Due to wedlock, they have no issues. A2 and A3 obtained 200 sovereign jewels from the defacto-complainant and pledged the same for business development of A2. All the accused persons did not attend the marriage of the defacto-complainant's brother and refused to send the defacto-complainant for marriage. All accused persons jointly harassed the defacto-complainant and driven her out from the matrimonial

home. Investigation is pending and objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. The learned counsel for the intervening petitioner further submitted that all the petitioners harassed the defacto-complainant and obtained 200 sovereign jewels from her. Now, the petitioners refused to return the above said jewels and hence, prayed to dismiss the petition.

7. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioners are U/s. 498(A), 406, 294(b) of IPC and Sec.4 of TNPWH Act. It is alleged that the petitioners have subjected the defacto-complainant to cruelty and refused to return her 200 sovereign jewels. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that no such occurrence happened as alleged by the prosecution, the defacto-complainant voluntarily left the matrimonial home. The learned Public Prosecutor and the learned counsel for the intervening petitioner submitted that all the accused persons tortured the defacto-complainant and refused to return her jewels. It is a case of matrimonial dispute. The petitioners 2 and 3 are mother-in-law and father-in-law of the defacto-complainant. Even as per the contention of the intervening petitioner/defacto-complainant, after the marriage, she resided with her in-laws only for 4 months and no complaint was forthwith from the defacto-complainant with regard to the dowry harassment during the said period of 4 months. The Hon'ble Apex Court is again and again insisting that the in-laws should not be unnecessarily dragged into the case of dowry harassment. After residing with in-laws for 4 months, the defacto-complainant and A1 lived in a separate residence. Therefore, considering the above said facts and there is no specific overt act as against the petitioners 2 and 3, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to them alone on conditions. Whereas, considering the overt act against the 1st petitioner, the nature of offences and the facts and circumstances of the case, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to him at this stage.

In the result, in the event of arrest or on their surrendering before the Court concerned **the petitioners 2 and 3** are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on

their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of Judicial Magistrate No.VI, Madurai subject to the following conditions:-

(i) The petitioners 2 and 3 shall surrender before the concerned Court within 15 days from today; failing which, the petition shall stand automatically canceled.

(ii) The petitioners 2 and 3 shall appear and sign before the Inspector of police, respondent police station **daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 30 days.**

(iii) The petitioners 2 and 3 shall co-operate with the investigation, shall not threaten the witnesses, shall not induce the witnesses and shall not cause hindrance to the pending investigation.

(iv) The petitioners 2 and 3 shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade him from disclosing such facts to the court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence.

(v) If there is any violation of condition, the Investigation officer is within his discretion to approach the Court of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned for cancellation of bail as per the ruling of the Hon'ble Supreme Court reported in **Shaji/Vs./ State of Kerala, (2005) AIR S.C.W. 5560.**

So far as the 1st petitioner is concerned, anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 10th day of June, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to

1. The J.M.No.6. Madurai.
2. The Inspector of Police, Anna Nagar AWP.S.
3. The Petitioners through their counsel.