



Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 02.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

Lakshmi Bala

... Petitioner

Vs.

1.State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Sankrapuram Police Station,
Kallakurichi District.

2.Rajendran

3.Arivazhagai

4.Manohrran

5.Udhaya

6.Kannagi

7.Sabari @ Sabrisasdha

... Respondents

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, praying to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondents / accused 2 to 7 herein dated 03.07.2025 made in Crl.M.P.No.1720 of 2025 on the file of the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kallakurichi.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Kasirajan

For R1 : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R2 to R7 : Mr.E.C.Ramesh



Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

ORDER

This petition has been filed to cancel the anticipatory bail granted to respondents / accused 2 to 7 herein dated 03.07.2025 made in Crl.M.P.No.1720 of 2025 on the file of the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kallakurichi.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that at the time of granting of anticipatory bail, the de facto complainant was in the hospital. However, the factum that the de facto complainant was in the hospital was suppressed before this Court and only upon such misrepresented fact this Court granted anticipatory bail. It is the further submission of the learned counsel for the petitioner that even after granting of anticipatory bail with a condition not to tamper with the witnesses, the respondents 2 to 7 have intimidated this petitioner, as she preferred application for transfer of investigation before the High Court.

3. The learned counsel for the respondents 2 to 7 would contend that the said incident is not a misrepresentation on the part of the petitioner and that the Court had acted only upon the instructions of the learned Public Prosecutor. Therefore, for the representation made by the learned Public



Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

Prosecutor, the respondents 2 to 7 cannot be blamed. Apart from that, the learned counsel would submit that the FIR is not in respect of this complaint, but it is in respect of another proceeding. Therefore, those cannot be sound grounds to interfere with the liberty granted by the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kallakurichi, in Crl.M.P.No.1720 of 2025 dated 03.07.2025.

4. The above submissions were reiterated by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent police.

5. I have given anxious consideration to the submissions made by the learned counsel on either side.

6. While looking into the order dated 03.07.2025, as rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kallakurichi, has recorded that the Public Prosecutor had conceded to the fact that the injured was discharged from the hospital. However, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied upon the discharge summary wherein the discharge of the injured is shown as 09.07.2025,



Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

whereas on 03.07.2025 itself the factum of discharge is recorded. No doubt, the very recording of the discharge of the injured is incorrect; however, whether the same could be a ground for cancellation of anticipatory bail is the point to be considered.

7. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, this representation was not made by the respondents 2 to 7 and the observation came into existence only based upon the submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor. As rightly contended by the learned counsel for the petitioner, for the incorrect submissions made by the learned Public Prosecutor, the petitioner cannot be penalised. Coming to the allegation of tampering with witnesses, the petitioner relies upon the FIR dated 18.01.2026, wherein there is only a reference that the respondents herein have intimidated the petitioner as to why she approached the High Court. Though an FIR was registered on 18.01.2026 in this regard, on perusal of the same, except the utterance of words, no further action has been made by the respondents 2 to 7 so as to invoke the harsh course of action for cancellation of anticipatory bail.



Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

WEB COPY8. It is a well-settled principle of law that cancellation of anticipatory bail would be ordered only in exceptional circumstances, and in this case, the grounds raised by the petitioner are not such exceptional circumstances so as to cancel the liberty granted by this Court. Therefore, this Court is of the firm view that there are no substantial grounds to cancel the anticipatory bail. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

02.04.2026

cda

To

- 1.The Principal District and Sessions Judge, Kallakurichi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Sankrapuram Police Station,
Kallakurichi District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

Crl.O.P.No.718 of 2026

02.04.2026