

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

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

Date: Wednesday, the 15th day of July 2026.

Crl.M.P. No.2298 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-004498-2026)

B.Poornima @ Keerthi, W/o.P.M.Sivasurya,
Aged about 34 years,

.. Petitioner/Accused.

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch (Team-I), Tambaram
Cr. No.55 of 2026
U/s.316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023.

.. Respondent/Complainant

This petition for bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.T.Raghavan, the learned counsel is appearing for the petitioner/accused and of M/s.V.Krishnamoorthy, the learned Public Prosecutor is appearing for the respondent/complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following

ORDER

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.316(2), 318(4), 61(2) of BNS, 2023.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply received. Heard both sides; records perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the victim is working in a private company under one Sivasurya - who is none else the husband of this petitioner. Using his position, the said Sivasurya induced the victim that

she will get huge profit and also pressurized her to invest money with one J.K.P.Zackaria. Further, this petitioner joined hands with the said Sivasurya, forcibly obtained the victim's SIM card and availed loan from 11 financial institutions to the tune of Rs.1,04,75,049/-. Though the accused have paid the monthly EMI installments at the initial point of time, after some period of time, they refused to pay the EMI, thereby, cheated the defacto complainant. Thereby a case in Cr. No.55 of 2026 has been registered on the file of respondent Police Station.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is innocent of offence; she was falsely arrested and remanded on 03.06.2026 and she is in judicial custody for the past 43 days; the co-accused - who is her husband, has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in CrI.O.P. No.15193 of 2026 dated 17.06.2026; 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.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, would re-iterate the prosecution version and further submits that the investigation is not yet completed. Moreover, the petitioner is involved in one another previous case and hence he prays for the dismissal of the petition.

7. From the submissions and perusal of records, it appears that the petitioner is in judicial custody for the past 43 days. It is further seen the co-accused has been granted bail by the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in CrI.O.P. No.15193 of 2026 dated 17.06.2026. Taking into consideration the duration of custody undergone by the petitioner/accused, the dispute prima facie appears to arise out of a business transactions involving money and

also considering the overall facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. In the result, this petition is allowed; The petitioner/accused is ordered to be released on bail on her execution of bond for Rs.25,000/- with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Alandur, with further conditions that,

1. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce copy of any identity proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity;
2. The petitioner/accused is directed to report before the respondent police station daily at 10.30 A.M. for a period of 30 days;
3. The petitioner/accused shall not tamper with the evidence either during investigation or trial;
4. The petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;
5. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself in accordance with the decision in *AIR 2006 SC 100 - P.K. Shaji Vs State of Kerala*.

Pronounced by me in the open Court, on this the 15th day of July 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To

The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Alandur.

The Inspector of Police, Central Crime Branch (Team-I), Tambaram

The Superintendent, Central Prison (Women), Puzhal, Chennai.