



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.10307 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CrI.O.P.No.10307 of 2026

V.Amsa

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State Rep. By
The Inspector of Police,
Sankari Police Station,
Salem District.
Crime No.0136 of 2026

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner's anticipatory bail in the event of her arrest in Crime No.0136 of 2026 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Selvaraj

For Respondent : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (CrI.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.0136 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

1/5



Crl.O.P.No.10307 of 2026

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant, who is the Executive Officer of Arulmigu Varadarajaperumal Temple, alleged that during the hundi opening conducted on 17.03.2026, the petitioner, who was present as the supervising officer, misappropriated a portion of the hundial money. Based on the surveillance camera footage, it is alleged that the petitioner had taken a sum of Rs.50,000/-. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner is nearing the age of superannuation. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police submitted that the petitioner, being an Assistant Commissioner of the HR & CE Department, was present during the hundi opening and that the allegation is supported by surveillance footage. He further submitted that custodial interrogation is necessary to unearth the extent of the concealment and also pointed out that the petitioner has one



CrI.O.P.No.10307 of 2026

previous case of a similar nature. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Taking into consideration the nature of the allegations, the specific overt act attributed to the petitioner, and the submission of the learned Government Advocate that custodial interrogation is required, this Court is of the firm view that the petitioner does not deserve the relief of anticipatory bail. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

27.04.2026

cda

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate-I, Sankari.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Sankari Police Station,
Salem District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.10307 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

Crl.O.P.No.10307 of 2026



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.10307 of 2026

27.04.2026