



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.30480 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 19.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.30480 of 2025

Anitha Sridhar

... Petitioner

Vs.

The Inspector of Police,
CCB-I, EDF-III, Chennai.
(Cr.No.154 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to grant anticipatory bail the petitioner/3rd
accused in the event of arrest in connection with Cr.No.154 of 2025 on the
file of the Inspector of Police, CCB-I, EDF-III, Chennai..

For Petitioner : Mr.Jaiharisudhan

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Section
316(5), 318(4), 351(2) r/w 61(2), 336(3), 338, 340(2) of BNS, 2023 and
Section 4 of the Tamilnadu Prohibition of Harassment of Women Act, 1998
1/5



Crl.OP.No.30480 of 2025

in Cr.No.154 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the sister of A1. A1 is alleged to have collected 9.5 kgs of gold from the defacto complainant for business purposes, failed to repay the money, and also misappropriated the gold. It is further alleged that A1 paid a sum of Rs. 8.2 lakhs to the petitioner, and on that basis, she has been added as an accused in this case. Subsequently, a complaint was registered against the petitioner. Hence, the present petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there are no specific allegations against the petitioner in the FIR and that the major allegations are only against the other accused, who have already been arrested. He further submitted that the petitioner, being only a relative of A1, has been falsely implicated in this case and therefore prayed for grant of



anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and reported that a total of five accused are involved in this case. The petitioner was originally ranked as A3 in the FIR and is now ranked as A4. He further submitted that out of the misappropriated amount, A1 had paid a sum of Rs. 8.2 lakhs to the petitioner, and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

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

1.

6. On perusal of the available records, it is revealed that the petitioner, being the sister of A1, had received Rs. 8.2 lakhs from A1. However, considering that she is a lady and is not directly involved in the acts of cheating and misappropriation, I am of the view that custodial interrogation



of the petitioner is not necessary. Hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned *Metropolitan Magistrate, CCB and CBCID, Egmore, Chennai* on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)** with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019]'. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify proofs to ensure their identity;



WEB COPY

CrI.OP.No.30480 of 2025



(c) The petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

(d) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in *P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*;

(e) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

19.11.2025

Vv

To

1. The Metropolitan Magistrate,
CCB and CBCID, Egmore, Chennai
2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-I, EDF-III, Chennai.

5/5



3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

CrI.OP.No.30480 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR, J.



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No.30480 of 2025



Vv

Crl.O.P.No.30480 of 2025

19.11.2025