



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

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

Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Thursday, this the 2nd day of July, 2026.

Cr.L.M.P.No.3061/2026

CNR No.TNMD010041282026

D.Muthulakshmi, W/o.Duraipandi

... Petitioner/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,

Thirumangalam Town P.S. in Cr.No.234/2026

... Respondent/Complainant.

This e-petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.S.Varatharajan, Advocate for the 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, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Heard both.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner/A2 submitted that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioner and others in Crime No.234/2026 for the offences u/s 67A of I.T.Act and 296(b), 64 & 49 of BNS against the petitioner and others. The petitioner is in no way connected with the offences alleged. In fact, the defacto-complainant and A1 loved each other and got marriage. The petitioner is mother of A1. The defacto-complainant suppressed the marriage, which took place between A1 and herself and lodged the present false complaint at the instigation of her parents. Co-accused/A3 was granted bail by this court. There is no specific overt act as against this petitioner. No similar petition is filed or pending before any superior courts. The petitioner apprehends arrest at the hands of police. The petitioner is 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 3 accused involved in this case and the petitioner is arrayed as A2. As per the case of the prosecution, the defacto-complainant and A1 are neighbours. A2 is the mother

of A1. A3 is the paternal uncle of A1. On 14.05.2026, A1 took the defacto-complainant to his house, promised her that he would marry her and forcibly committed rape on the defacto-complainant and recorded the same in his mobile phone. This was continued on many occasions not only with the defacto-complainant but also with various girls. Now, A1 threatens the defacto-complainant that if she would not engage in a physical relationship with him, he would leak the above said video in social media. Instead of condemning A1, his mother and paternal uncle, who are A2 and A3 respectively, actually supported A1 and assisted him abetted him in commission of the offences. A1 is still in custody. Investigation is pending and strongly objected to allow the petition.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner/accused are u/s 67A of I.T.Act and 296(b), 64 & 49 of BNS. On perusal of F.I.R., A1 is alleged to have sexual intercourse forcibly with the defacto-complainant. Instead of condemning A1, his mother and paternal uncle, who are A2 and A3 respectively, actually supported A1 and assisted him abetted him in commission of the offences. Admittedly, this court granted bail to A3, considering the period of custody. Whereas, the petitioner is seeking anticipatory bail, who cannot claim parity with him. Custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much essential. Investigation is at early stage. Considering all these aspects, the seriousness of offences, the overt act attributed against the petitioner and the pending stage of investigation, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, accordingly, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 2nd day of July, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge,
Madurai

Copy to : The J.M.Thirumangalam.