



CRL OP(MD). No.7738 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 30/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.7738 of 2026

Ramya

... Petitioner/ Accused No.2

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep By,  
The Inspector of Police,  
CCB- Police Station,  
Madurai District.  
(In Crime No.9 of 2026).

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.9 of 2026 on the file of the  
respondent Police.

For Petitioner : S. Mahendra Pathy,  
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : R.Ramasamy

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD), No.7738 of 2026

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 336(2), 336(3) and 351(3) of BNS, 2023 in Crime No.9 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is running V.V.Gold works by manufacturing gold jewels and gave it to retailers and the petitioner and her husband were introduced by one Rajesh to the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant gave jewels to the petitioner and her husband, who is running a business in the name and style of 'Sri Guhan Gold and Silvers' from the year 2023 and the petitioner's husband/A1 also introduced A3 to the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant also gave jewels to him. Thereafter, when the defacto complainant demanded a sum of Rs.4,20,00,000/- for the 3590 grams of jewels received by the accused, the accused threatened him with dire consequences and then only, he came to know that they cheated him. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and she was falsely implicated in this case and



CRL OP(MD), No.7738 of 2026

she has no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that this is the second anticipatory bail petition and earlier petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court on 12.02.2026. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that the accused have cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.4,20,00,000/- for 3590 grams of gold jewels between 2023 to 2025 by pledging the same by using fake receipts and the investigation is still pending and the earlier anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner was dismissed by this Court and there are no chance of circumstance. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervener would submit that the offence committed by the petitioner is grave in nature and hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



CRL OP(MD), No.7738 of 2026

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and according to the prosecution, the petitioner is the owner of the shop in which the jewels were pledged and the investigation is in initial stage and there are no change of circumstance, I am declined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, at this stage.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

(P D B J)  
30.04.2026  
2/2

dss



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.7738 of 2026

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,  
CCB- Police Station,  
Madurai District.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,  
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD), No.7738 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

DSS

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.7738 of 2026

Date : 30/04/2026  
2/2