



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 7866 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 27-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP No. 7866 of 2026

Sangtha @ Sangeetha

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep. by the Sub-Inspector of Police
Perambalur Police Station
Perambalur District
In Cr. No.154/2026.

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 483 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS), 2023, to grant bail to the petitioner in Cr.No.154 of 2026 on the file of the respondent Police Station.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.P.Pugalenth

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Vinoth Kumar
Government Advocate
(Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 05.03.2026 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 232 and 351(3) of the Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023, in Crime No.154 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.



2. Accordingly to the prosecution, on 17.12.2025, at about 9:30 PM, one Azhagiri, a life convict, currently in prison, contacted the defacto complainant through mobile phone, which was obtained from the escort police. The convict reportedly issued death threats to the defacto complainant, warning him against deposing as a witness in a pending murder trial before the Trichy Court involving his close associates. Subsequently, the petitioner, who is the wife of the said life convict, is alleged to have further intimidated the defacto complainant and warned him that if he proceed to give evidence, he would be murdered by their associates. Following these repeated threats to his life, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint on 04.03.206 before the respondent police.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent, she has been falsely implicated in the present case. The learned counsel would further submit that the case of the prosecution is a fabricated one, as she has never contacted the defacto complainant at any point. The learned counsel contends that this case has been registered solely to ensure her detention without any substantive evidence. It is further contended that the petitioner has been in custody since 05.03.2026, and she is a mother of two school going children, and that her further incarceration is not necessary for the purpose of investigation, he prayed for the grant of bail to the petitioner.



4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for the respondent police, strongly opposes the bail application and submitted that the case is of serious in nature, as it involves the systematic intimidation of witnesses by the petitioner's husband, who is a life convict, and the petitioner herself. He further stated that accused persons are actively attempting to interfere with the judicial process by deterring witnesses from deposing in a pending murder trial. The learned Government Advocate further contends that if the petitioner is enlarged on bail at this stage, there is a reasonable apprehension that she will continue to tamper with evidence and intimidate witnesses, thereby making it difficult for the prosecution to ensure their presence before the Court to depose without fear.

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

6. Taking into account the gravity of the allegations, specifically the attempt to undermine the judicial process by threatening a witness in a murder trial, and considering the submission of the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) that the investigation is still at a crucial stage, this Court finds that the petitioner's release could jeopardize the safety of the witnesses and the integrity of the trial. Though the learned counsel for the petitioner raises the



ground that the petitioner is a mother of two school going children, the fact that these threats were allegedly carried out by a life convict, who is in judicial custody and by his wife, significantly increases the gravity of the offence. Consequently, this Court is of the view that it is not appropriate to grant bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

27-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

Jeni

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court No.1, Perambalur.
2. The Superintendent, Special Prison for Women, Trichy.
3. The Sub- Inspector of Police
Perambalur Police Station, Perambalur District.
4. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 7866 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

Jeni

CRL OP No. 7866 of 2026

27-03-2026