

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Date: Tuesday, the 09th day of June 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.1782 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-003619-2026)

R.Kavitha, aged 24 years, D/o.Ramganesha,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
C.C.B. - Tambaram,
Cr. No.51 of 2026

.. Respondent/Complainant

U/s.61(2), 111, 318(4) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.66C and 66D of the
Information Technology Act, 2000.

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.M.Mathan Raj, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and of M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor is appearing for the respondent/complainant, upon hearing the arguments and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following

O R D E R

This petition is filed by the petitioner/accused U/s.483 of BNSS 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail.

2. The petitioner/accused is facing charges for the alleged offences punishable U/s.61(2), 111, 318(4) of BNS, 2023 r/w. Sec.66C and 66D of the Information Technology Act, 2000.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply

received. Heard both sides; records perused.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is falsely implicated in this case; she was arrested on 14.05.2026 and she is in judicial custody for the past 27 days; according to the statement of the victim one Sakthivel, the alleged occurrence took place from 20.01.2026 to 16.02.2026; however, during the relevant point of time, the petitioner was not even working as employee in the said company, in fact the petitioner's marriage was took place on 06.02.2026; however the respondent police without conducting proper preliminary enquiry implicated this petition in the case and falsely arrested her; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon her and she is ready to offer substantial sureties before the Court, thereby prayed for enlargement on bail.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, strongly objected to grant bail to the petitioner stating that the petitioner along with other accused have colluded themselves, contacted the innocent victims over phone and induced and lured them to obtain life-insurance through their firm namely RB Business Solutions, thereby received money through online. Further, by stating various reasons the accused have swindled more money from the victims thereby cheated them. One victim by name Sakthivel had paid a sum of Rs.15,61,163/- in total on various occasions. Like wise the accused have cheated somany victims to the tune of Rs.38,66,082/-. He further submitted that the investigation is only at the preliminary stage and the amount involved in the offence is not yet recovered and the other accused are yet to be secured. At this stage, if the

petitioner is enlarged on bail, she will tamper with the evidences and hamper the investigation. Hence, he vehemently opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. Taking into consideration the gravity of the offence, nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner and the role played by the petitioner in the offence, the other accused involved in the offence are not yet arrested, the investigation seemed to be only at the preliminary stage, cheated amount is not yet recovered, possibility of tamper the evidences as stated by the prosecution, the strong objection made by the prosecution and also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is of the considered view that it is not the fit case to grant bail to the petitioner/accused. **Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.**

Pronounced by me in open Court, on this the 09th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.