



CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

S.Sasikala

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch
Trichy city.
(Crime No. 33 of 2024)

...Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Prakash
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.B.Jameelarasu

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 33 of 2024 on the file of the
respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 406, 420 506(i), 465 of IPC @ Sections 468, 109 and 471 of IPC in Crime No. 33 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the petitioner's husband are friends. Therefore, the petitioner's husband requested the defacto complainant to arrange money to repay the housing loan availed by them. After redumption of the document from the bank, they assured to sell the said property in favour of the defacto complainant, due to which the defacto complainant arranged a sum of Rs.69,78,566/- and given to the petitioner's husband and also paid a sum of Rs.30,00,000/- as cash. However, the petitioner's husband refused to sell the property to the defacto complainant and sold the property to one Senthilkumar on 25.04.2024. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is

2/7



CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

no way connected in the above said incident. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2015 and however, the FIR has been registered in the year 2024 and the petitioner was also granted interim anticipatory bail by this Court. He would further submit that A1 was arrested and released on bail. Hence, he prayed to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the petitioner and her husband/A1 approached the defacto complainant to settle the loan pending in SBI and thereby, he availed loan from Kotak Mahindra Bank and the documents which were mortgaged in favour of SBI bank were directly transferred to Kotak Mahindra Bank and thereafter, the petitioner and her husband redeemed the same and sold the property to some other person and thereby, they cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit




CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 406, 420 506(i), 465 of IPC @ Sections 468, 109 and 471 of IPC in Crime No. 33 of 2024. He further submits that there is a money transaction between the petitioner's husband and the defacto complainant and the petitioner has no previous case. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and considering the facts that the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2015 and however, the complaint was lodged in the year 2024 and there is a huge delay in registering FIR and there is a money transaction between the parties and the petitioner is the wife of main accused/A1, who was arrested and released on bail and the petitioner was also granted interim anticipatory bail and no previous case is pending against the petitioner, I



CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate-I, Trichy and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police, on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

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

[e] the petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take



CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

WEB COPY

appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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].

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

apd

(P D B J)
10.04.2026
(2/2)

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-I, Trichy.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch
Trichy city.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 905 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 905 of 2025

Date : 10.04.2026
(2/2)