



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.32492 of 2025

A.S.Geethanjali

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State Rep. by
Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station 22,
Mylapore, Chennai.
(Crime No.21 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the Petitioner/Accused on bail in
Crime No.21 of 2025 pending on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Gokul

For Intervenor : Mr.R.Balakrishnan

For Respondent : Mr.L.Baskaran,

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, herein apprehending arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offence punishable under Sections 351 of BNS and
Section 9(f), 10 & 17 of Protection of Child From Sexual Offences Act, 2012



WEB COPY

in Crime No.21 of 2025, registered on the file of the respondent, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first accused in this case misbehaved with the defacto complainant's granddaughter while she was travelling in a public transport vehicle. This was intimated to the classmates of victim girl, it was passed on to some outsiders. The defacto complainant was immediately called to the office of School, where this petitioner, who is the Principal, attempted to screen the offence. Hence, she was also added as accused in this case. Hence the present petition.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner, who is the Headmistress of School, had no role whatsoever in the alleged incident, which is stated to have occurred on 03.09.2025 in a public transport train while returning from a Rotary Club. Once the occurrence was brought her knowledge, she had immediately inform the same to the Correspondent of School and Accused No.1 was also suspended from School and she had not attempted to suppress the occurrence. But the complaint was lodged before she receive instructions from Correspondent, and false allegation levelled against her. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor/Defacto Complainant



WEB COPY

submitted that, she has approached the petitioner herein immediately, after she came to know about the occurrence and instead of taking legal action, this petitioner attempted to pacify her and resist her from lodging complaint, hence he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (CrI.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the investigation has not yet been completed. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the submissions made by learned counsels on either side, the fact that the petitioner is a lady and, the main allegation being only against the first accused and allegation against the petitioner is that, she attempted to screen the offence, and nature of allegation against the Accused No.1 is that he attempted to commit sexual assault on the victim girl, and though the investigation has not been completed, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with 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 days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **POCSO Court, Chennai**, on condition that the petitioners shall execute a bond for a sum of



WEB COPY

Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

[a] if the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

[b] the sureties shall affix her 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 the identity proofs to ensure her identity;

[c] the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily 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 aforementioned conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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)13 SCC 283]**;



WEB COPY

[e] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh

FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

27.11.2025

kmm

To

1. The POCSO Court, Chennai.
2. The Inspector of Police
All Women Police Station 22,
Mylapore, Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.32492 of 2025

27.11.2025