



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 43 of 2026



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 06-01-2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 43 of 2026

S. Revathy

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
CCB Police Station, Tiruppur.
(Crime No. 22/2025).

Respondent(s)

PRAYER: This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of BNSS to enlarge the Petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 22 of 2025 on the file of the Respondent Police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.Jugal Kumar

For Respondent(s): Ms.J.R.Archana, GA (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor: Mr.G.Santhanu

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 318(4), 351(2) of BNS in connection with the Cr. No.22 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, the wife of A1/Sivashankar, conspired with other co-accused, under the pretext of arranging loan from bank for businesses purposes, obtained a huge sum of



money for about Rs.1 crore and 1.3 lakhs and subsequently they failed to arrange the promised loan and did not return the money, despite repeated demands. When the defacto complainant demanded repayment, the petitioner jointly abused him with obscene language and threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner is an innocent person, and she has been falsely implicated in this case by the respondent police. He further submitted that petitioner who is the wife of A1, has not collected any amount directly from the defacto complainant and has no role in this case. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail in this case.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor submits that the petitioner has involved in another case in Crime No.14 of 2025 and the Hon'ble Sub Court, Kanniyakumari District, by order dated 26.06.2025, has dismissed the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner and if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, she will indulge in similar offence. Hence, he raised strong objection.

5. Learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution's case and on instructions submitted that totally seven accused involved in this case and petitioner has



been arrayed as A2, who is a wife of A1, having one case is pending against her in similar nature and no money has been recovered. She further submitted that investigation in this case is still pending and raised strong objection for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering that the petitioner being a woman, and the FIR merely records her presence at the scene when the defacto complainant demanded repayment; without any specific allegation that she received money directly from the defacto complainant or actively collected funds and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required for investigation purposes, I am inclined to grant the anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on her appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Tiruppur**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at



10.30 am., for a period two weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

WEB COPY

[b] the petitioner shall not, directly or indirectly, make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade them from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[c] the petitioner shall not leave India without the previous permission of the Court;

[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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)AIR SCW 5560].

[f] If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.2023.

06-01-2026

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



1.The Inspector of Police,
CCB Police Station, Tiruppur.

3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 43 of 2026



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

jai

CRL OP No. 43 of 2026

06-01-2026