



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10415 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 11.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 10415 of 2026

Abinaya

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Sattur Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.223 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Jagadeeshwaran
Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.A.Raja


PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Cr.No. 223 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 27.04.2026, for the offences punishable under and Sections 331(4),



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10415 of 2026

305(a) of BNS altered into Sections 331(4), 305(a), r/w 61 of BNS, in Crime No.223 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the accused persons entered into the defacto complainant's house through rear entrance and committed theft of 122.5 sovereigns of gold jewels, 800 grams of silver articles, and cash Rs.45,000/- kept in the bureau. The entire occurrence was captured in the CCTV footage. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent and she was falsely implicated in this case and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Due to the previous enmity this false case has been foisted against the petitioner. On the basis of the confession statement of the co-accused only she was added in this case. Co-accused have also been released on bail. Hence, he prayed bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (crl. Side) appearing for the respondent would submit that the offence are grave in nature. The petitioner is the master mind of the occurrence. She only arranged the other accused persons



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10415 of 2026

to commit the theft. She informed the accused persons about the structure of the house. The petitioner has no previous case. Part of the properties were recovered. Some of the properties yet to be recovered. Investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

5.The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the petitioner has previous enmity with the defacto complainant. Hence, she along arranged these persons to commit the theft. She informed about the structure of the house and other things to the accused persons. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, considering the nature of charges levelled against the petitioner, the petitioner is not named accused in this case, even according to the prosecution, the petitioner was arrayed as accused, only based on the confession of co-accused she was implicated in this case, the properties were partly recovered, co-accused also released on bail by the Sessions Court, there is no previous



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.10415 of 2026

case against the petitioner, and considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner

subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on 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 No.II, Sattur**, and on further conditions that:


[b] the petitioner shall report before the **respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., until further orders:**

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/she is suspected;

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

[e] 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 her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10415 of 2026

WEB COPY

Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take 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 BNS.

(P D B J)
11.06.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Sattur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Sattur Town Police Station,
Virudhunagar District. (Crime No.223 of 2026)
- 3.The Superintendent, Central Jail, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli District.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10415 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 10415 of 2026

Date : 11.06.2026