



CRL OP(MD). No.13464 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 09/07/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL OP(MD). No.13464 of 2026

1. R. Reshma

2. Janaki

... Petitioners/ Accused

Rank Not Known

Vs

State of Tamilnadu Rep by,

The Inspector of Police,

Sattur Town Police Station,

Virudhunagar District.

Cr.No.223 of 2026.

... Respondent/Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 223/2026 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioners : M/s. G.Gowtham,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian,
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.C.M.Arumugam
Advocate.

ORDER

The petitioners apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under



CRL OP(MD). No.13464 of 2026

Sections 331(4), 305(a) of BNS Act, 2023, in Crime No.223 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners herein are the ranked as A8 & A9. A1 in this case, who is a notorious thief and involved in 27 cases, along with other accused, committed the theft of 122 sovereigns of gold jewels, silver weighing about 800 grams and other silver ornaments worth about Rs.45,000. Based on the statement recorded, after his arrest, only 56 sovereigns of gold jewels were recovered and the remaining jewels are yet to be recovered. The stolen jewels were handed over to the petitioners by A1, who are the wife and mother of A1, and therefore, they were added as accused.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that since the petitioners herein are wife and mother of A1, they were falsely implicated in this case. A1 has already been granted bail, and the petitioners are ready to co-operate with the



CRL OP(MD). No.13464 of 2026

investigation. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Counsel For State of TN (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and on instructions, submitted that out of the total stolen gold, only a part of the jewels has been recovered and that, as per the statement of A1, the remaining jewels are in the possession of the petitioners and hence, granting anticipatory bail would hamper the recovery and the investigation is at preliminary stage. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervenor reiterated the submission made by the learned Counsel For State of TN (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police and also opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. I have gone through the FIR and also the connected materials.

7. Considering the nature of allegations against the petitioners, and also considering the huge quantity of gold involved in this case and the



CRL OP(MD). No.13464 of 2026

investigation is still pending, granting anticipatory bail would affect the possibility of recovery, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

09.07.2026

dss

To

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.13464 of 2026

K. RAJASEKAR,J

DSS

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.13464 of 2026

Date : 09/07/2026