



CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 11/06/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

Subha

... Petitioner/ Accused No.2

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station,
Sivagangai District.
(Crime No.157 of 2026).

... Respondent/ Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.157 of 2026 on the file of the
respondent Police.

For Petitioner : Shangeetha A S,
Advocate.

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

For Intervener : Mr.D.Ramesh Kumar

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506(i) of IPC (Corresponding offences 316(2), 318(4) and 351(2) of BNS, 2023), in Crime No.157 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that in the year 2021, A1, who is the husband of the petitioner induced the defacto complainant to invest huge money to commence a partnership business and assuring that the amount would be invested in such manner to get profit of Rs.50,00,000/-. On believing his words, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.10 lakhs to the petitioner's bank account on various dates. Thereafter, A1 repaid only Rs.2 lakhs. When demanded the balance, the accused abused the defacto complainant in filthy language and threatened him with dire consequences. Thereby, cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

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



CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

she has no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that no previous case is pending as against the petitioner. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that there is a money dispute between the parties and the accused cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.10 lakhs by giving a false promise that he would get huge profit in a partnership business and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He would further submit that no previous case is pending against the petitioner and a part of the amount was already paid to the defacto complainant.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervener would submit that the petitioner induced the defacto complainant to pay money for commencing a partnership business and on believing his words, he paid a sum of Rs.10 lakhs and thereafter, neither started a business nor shared any profit to the defacto complainant and he only repaid a sum of Rs.2 lakhs and thereby, cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of



CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

Rs.8 lakhs. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and even as per FIR, it appears that there are money transactions between the parties in respect of partnership business and a part of the amount has been returned to the defacto complainant and no previous case is pending against the petitioner, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **Judicial Magistrate Court, Karaikudi**, on condition that the petitioner shall 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 concerned and on further conditions that:



CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

WEB COPY

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police, every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of 4 weeks and thereafter as and when required for the interrogation.

[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 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.

11.06.2026

dss



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.10722 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

dss

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court, Karaikudi.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Karaikudi North Police Station, Sivagangai District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10722 of 2026

Date : 11/06/2026