



WEB COPY

CRL.A.(MD).No.1244 of



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

RESERVED ON : 25.11.2025

PRONOUNCED ON : 28.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.MURALI SHANKAR

CRL.A(MD).No.1244 of 2025

Latchumi

.. Appellant/Petitioner/Sole Accused

Vs.

1.State of Tamil Nadu represented by

The Assistant Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Assistant Superintendent of Police,
Thiruverumbur Sub Division,
Trichy District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruverumbur Police Station,
Trichy District.

(Crime No.891 of 2025 ... Respondents 1 and 2/Respondents 1 and 2/
Complainant

3.Saravanakumar

... Respondent No.3/Respondent No.3/
Defacto complainant

PRAYER: Criminal Appeal filed under Section 14A(2) of SC/ST (PoA) Act to set aside the order dated 25.10.2025 made in CrI.M.P.No.4713 of 2025, on the file of the learned I Additional District and Sessions Judge (PCR), Tiruchirappalli in connection with Cr.No.891 of 2025, on the file of the second respondent police and enlarge the appellant on bail.



WEB COPY

CRL.A.(MD).No.1244 of



For Appellant : Mr.K.M.Karunakaran

For Respondents : Mr.K.Gnanasekaran
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)
for R.1 and R.2

: R.3 – Party in person

JUDGMENT

The Criminal Appeal is directed against the order passed in CrI.M.P.No. 4713 of 2025, dated 25.10.2025, on the file of I Additional District and Sessions Judge (PCR), Tiruchirappalli, in dismissing the petition for bail filed under Section 483 of BNSS.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant's father Ramesh (deceased) and her mother were in separation for 15 years, that the deceased was residing in the defacto complainant's grandmother's house, that on 25.09.2025, at about 09.00p.m., the first accused Veeramuthu alias Muthuvel, who is the husband of the second accused / appellant herein Lakshmi, came to the house and questioned the deceased Ramesh for conversing with his wife Lakshmi and thereafter, at about 10.15p.m., the first accused abused the deceased Ramesh in filthy language and brutally attacked with a knife and stabbed him on his ribs and chest, causing his death and that the defcto compali



with the help of nearby persons carried his father's body and placed it in front of his grandmother's house. On the basis of the complaint lodged by the defacto complainant – the third respondent herein, F.I.R., came to be registered in Cr.No. 891 of 2025 on 25.09.2025, for the offences under Sections 296(b), 103(1), 351(3) of BNSS.

3. It is not in dispute that the appellant, who is the second accused was arrested on 26.09.2025 and is in judicial custody. It is also not in dispute that the appellant moved an application for bail under Section 483 of BNSS in CrI.M.P.4713 of 2025 before I Additional District Sessions Court (PCR), Tiruchirappalli and the learned Sessions Judge, after enquiry, passed the impugned order dated 25.10.2025 dismissing the bail petition. Aggrieved by the order of dismissal, the present appeal came to be filed.

4. The learned Counsel for the appellant would submit that the appellant is innocent and is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence, but she has been falsely implicated in the above case, that there is absolutely no iota of materials to establish that the appellant has got any role in the alleged occurrence, that the appellant's name was not found in the F.I.R., but subsequently, implicated without conducting proper investigation, that the learned Sessions Judge, without considering the reasons canvassed, has



dismissed her bail application in a mechanical fashion and that since the appellant is in judicial custody for the past more 60 days, she may be enlarged on bail.

5. In response to the notice received, the third respondent/defacto complainant appeared in person and raised objections that the appellant by alleging that she was not having any husband, had relationship with his father and subsequently cheated him and that the appellant is the main reason for the alleged occurrence and that therefore, he is having serious objection to enlarge the appellant on bail.

6. The first respondent filed a counter affidavit raising objections.

7. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the appellant had illicit affairs with the deceased Ramesh – father of the defacto complainant, that subsequently she was not in terms with the deceased and as the deceased was pressurising her to continue the relationship, the appellant and her husband – first accused conspired together to kill the defacto complainant's father and in pursuance of the same, the said Ramesh was killed brutally, that the first accused gave a voluntary confession statement implicating the involvement of the appellant/second accused in the alleged occurrence, that the investigation



is still pending and that therefore, since the appellant is not entitled to be released on bail, her appeal is liable to be dismissed.

8. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) has produced the copy of the confession statement alleged to have been given by the first accused.

9. The second respondent, after initial investigation and after coming to know about the applicability of SC/ST (POA) Act, altered the case for the offences under Sections 296(b), 130(1), 351(3), 61(2) of BNSS and under Section 3(2)(v) of SC/ST (POA) Act and submitted an alteration report. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) has also produced the copy of the alteration report.

10. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that if the appellant is released on bail, she will hamper the investigation and there is every possibility of absconding.

11. Considering the above facts and circumstances, gravity of the offences alleged, the period of incarceration and the objections raised by the defacto complainant and the respondent police, this Court is not inclined to enlarge the



appellant on bail at this point of time. Consequently, this Court concludes that the appeal is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed.

WEB COPY

12. In the result, the Criminal Appeal is dismissed, confirming the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.4713 of 2025, dated 25.10.2025, on the file of I Additional District and Sessions Judge (PCR), Tiruchirappalli.

28.11.2025

NCC : Yes/No

Index : Yes/No

Internet : Yes/No

SSL



To

1. The I Additional District and Sessions Court (PCR), Tiruchirappalli.
2. The Assistant Superintendent of Police,
Office of the Assistant Superintendent of Police,
Thiruverumbur Sub Division,
Trichy District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Thiruverumbur Police Station,
Trichy District.
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.
5. The Section Officer,
Criminal Section,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL.A.(MD).No.1244 of

K.MURALI SHANKAR, J.

SSL

PRE-DELIVERY JUDGMENT MADE IN

CRL.A(MD).No.1244 of 2025

28.11.2025