

TNMD010033712026



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

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

Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Friday, this the 12th day of June, 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.2591/2026

CNR No.TNMD010033712026

1. Dinesh, S/o.Thoppusamy

2. T.Bharath, S/o.Thoppusamy

3. C.Raghu, S/o.Chinnaverathevan

... Petitioners/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,

Usilampatti AWP.S. in Cr.No.12/2026

... Respondent/Complainant.

This e-petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.A.Mohammed Arif, Advocate for the petitioners 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. Heard both.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners/A5 to A7 would submit that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioners and others in Cr.No.12/2026 for the offences u/s. 69 and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023. The petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. The petitioners are in no way connected with this case and they have been falsely implicated in this case. Investigation is almost over. No similar petition is filed or pending before any superior courts. 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 to allow the petition.

4. Per contra, the learned Public Prosecutor submitted that totally there are 7 accused persons in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A5 to A7. As per the

case of the prosecution, the defacto-complainant is working as staff nurse. The defacto-complainant and A1 loved each other, for the past 3 years. A1 had physical contact on several times with the defacto-complainant on false promise of marriage. Thereafter, A1 arranged his marriage with another one. When the defacto-complainant asked about the same, A2, who is the mother of A1 threatened her, by opening the Gas cylinder at defacto-complainant's house. On 09.03.2026 all the accused persons received a sum of Rs.4,50,000/- from A2 to settle the dispute raised by the defacto-complainant and threatened the defacto-complainant and her parents with dire consequences. Investigation is pending and objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner are U/s.69 and 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023. On perusal of F.I.R., the overt act for the offence u/s. 69 of BNS is only against A1. The petitioners are alleged to have criminally intimidated the defacto-complainant and her parents. No bad antecedent is reported against the petitioners. Substantial part of investigation ought to have been completed by this time. Considering all these aspects, the limited overt act attributed against the petitioners and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on conditions.

In the result, in the event of arrest or on their surrendering before the Court concerned the petitioners 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.I, Usilampatti subject to the following conditions:-

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

(ii) The petitioners 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 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 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.**

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 12th day of June, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to

1. The J.M.No.1. Usilampatti.
2. The Inspector of Police, Usilampatti AWP.S.
3. The Petitioners through their counsel.