



Criminal Appeal No.1719 of 2025

T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

Today, this case is listed under the caption, “For Being Mentioned” at the instance of the learned counsel for appellant.

2. The learned counsel for appellant submitted that this Court vide Judgment dated 18.11.2025, set aside the Order dated 04.11.2025 in CrI.M.P.No.908 of 2025 passed by the learned Sessions Judge, The Nilgiris District, Udthagamandalam and allowed Criminal Appeal No.1719 of 2025 and consequently, released the appellant on bail subject to certain conditions. However, in Paragraph No.6 of the said judgment, it has been recorded by this Court that the appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties, each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Special Court for Trial of Cases under SC/ST (POA) Act,



Coimbatore.

WEB COPY

2.1. It is further submitted by the learned counsel for appellant that in Paragraph No.6 of the Judgment dated 18.11.2025 in Crl.A.No.1719 of 2025, name of the Judge to whom satisfaction the bail bond has to be executed by the appellant has been wrongly typed as learned Sessions Judge, Special Court for Trial of Cases under SC/ST (POA) Act, Coimbatore, instead of, learned Sessions Judge, The Nilgiris District, Udthagamandalam. Therefore, the learned counsel for appellant prayed that the said typographical error may be rectified.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing on behalf of respondents 1 & 2 and Mr.V.Rajesh, learned counsel appearing on behalf of 3rd respondent/*de-facto* complainant submitted in unison that they have no serious objection for rectifying the aforesaid typographical error crept-in in



Paragraph No.6 of the Judgment dated 18.11.2025 in Crl.A.No.1719 of 2025.

4. Considering the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, this Court is inclined to rectify the typographical error crept-in in Paragraph No.6 of the Judgment dated 18.11.2025 in Crl.A.No.1719 of 2025. Accordingly, the same is rectified and Paragraph No.6 of the said judgment reads as follows:

“6. The appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand Only) with two sureties, each for a likesum to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, The Nilgiris District, Udhagamandalam.”

5. In all other aspects, Judgment dated 18.11.2025 in Crl.A.No.1719



of 2025 shall remain unaltered. Registry is directed to issue a fresh judgment copy to all concerned, after carrying out the aforesaid correction.

20.11.2025

mrr

Index: Yes/No

Speaking Order (or) Non-Speaking Order

Note to Registry: Issue order copy on 20.11.2025



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.

mrr

Crl.A.No.1719 of 2025

20.11.2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 18-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRL A No. 1719 of 2025

1. Sheela @ Sheela Powell
D/o.George Powell, W/o.Mogan,
No.2, Claremont, Club Road,
Udhagamandalam, The Nilgiris.

Appellant(s)

Vs

1. The Deputy Superintendent of
Police,
Udhagamandalam, The Nilgiris.

2.The State Rep by, The Inspector of
Police,
B-1/T-1, Ooty Town Central Police

6/11



Station, The Nilgiris, Cr.No.215/2025.

3.Poomadevi

W/o.Anrs Kuttanm, Door No.7/26,
Muthunadu Mund, Thalaikundha,
Ooty, The Nilgiris.

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To set aside the order dated 04.11.2025 made in CrI.M.P.No.908/2025 passed by the Learned Sessions Judge of the Nilgiris District at Udhagamandalam.

For Appellant(s): Mr.J.Franklin

For Respondent(s): Mr.V.Meganathan
Government Advocate
(CrI.side)

ORDER

This Criminal Appeal has filed to set aside the order dated 04.11.2025 made in CrI.M.P.No.908/2025 passed by the Learned Sessions Judge of the Nilgiris District at Udhagamandalam, and to allow the above Criminal appeal by enlarging the appellant on bail.

7/11



WEB COPY

2. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the appellant and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondents and perused the materials placed before this Court.

3. The learned counsel for the appellant submitted that the appellant used to purchase handicraft items manufactured by the Toda community people. On the date of the occurrence, there was a wordy quarrel regarding certain embroidery products. Another group of people had also offered to sell embroidery goods to the petitioner. Aggrieved by this, the defacto complainant, from whom the appellant was also intending to purchase handicrafts, lodged a false complaint alleging that the appellant ill-treated the defacto complainant and the Toda community people by abusing them by their caste name in the presence of the public. He further submitted that the appellant is aged about 62 years and has been purchasing



embroidery articles from the Toda community for nearly 10 years. On the date of the incident, due to rivalry between two groups, she was falsely implicated.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that, the defacto complainant and the petitioner have been having business transactions for all these years. He further submitted that the investigation is almost completed.

5. Considering the above facts and circumstances, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the appellant. Accordingly, the order made in Crl.M.P.No.908 of 2025 dated 04.11.2025 on the file of the Sessions Judge, Nilgiris District, Udthagamandalam, is hereby set aside. This Criminal Appeal stands allowed.



WEB COPY

6. The appellant is ordered to be released on bail on his execution of a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Sessions Judge, Special Court for Trial of Cases under SC/ST (POA) Act, Coimbatore and on further conditions that:

[a] The petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the appellant shall report before the respondent police on every Tuesday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two months.

[c] the appellant shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[d] the appellant shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the

10/11



WEB COPY

appellant in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the appellant released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in **P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560]**.

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS.

(g) the petitioner shall not have any communication with the victim.

18-11-2025

Index:Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet:Yes

Neutral Citation:Yes/No

rri

Note: Issue order copy by 19.11.2025



WEB COPY

To

1.The Deputy Superintendent of
Police,
Udhagamandalam, The Nilgiris.

2.The State Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
B-1/T-1, Ooty Town Central Police
Station, The Nilgiris, Cr.No.215/2025.

3.Poomadevi
W/o.Anrs Kuttanm, Door No.7/26,
Muthunadu Mund, Thalaikundha,
Ooty, The Nilgiris.

4. Sessions Judge of the Nilgiris
District at Udhagamandalam.

5.The superintendent,
Special Prison for Women,
Coimbatore.

6.The public prosecutor,
High Court of Madras, Chennai.

12/11



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.
rri

CRLA No. 1719 of 2025



WEB COPY



18-11-2025