

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
PERAMBALUR, STATE OF TAMILNADU.

Present: Thiru.V.Padmanabhan, M.A., M.L., D.H.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge.

Wednesday, this the 18th day of March, 2026

CrI.M.P.No.283/2026
(CNR No.TNPB01-000460-2026)

Sangtha @ Sangeetha, 39/2026, (A2),
D/o.Palani.

...Petitioner/Accused.

-vs-

State Rep. by
the Sub-Inspector of police,
Perambalur P.S.
In Cr. No.154/2026.

...Respondent/Complainant.

Petition through e-filed dated 10.03.2026 and U/s.483 of BNSS Act seeking bail for the petitioner/accused.

This petition coming on this day before me for order in the presence of Thiruvallargal.K.Prabudevan, Dhineshkumar, N.Kalaiselvan and P.Anbalagan, Advocates for the petitioner and the Public Prosecutor for the State and upon hearing both sides, this Court has delivered the following...

ORDER

The petitioner/accused seeks bail for the alleged offences U/S.232 and 351(3) of BNS.

2. The prosecution case is that, on 17.12.2025, at about 9.30 pm, A1 contacted the defacto complainant through cell phone and threatened him by stating, he should not give evidence in murder case pending in Trichy Court against his close associate namely Bablu @ Prabhu. Subsequently, A2 also threatened by stating that she is A1's wife and if he gives evidence he will be murdered through his associates. They contacted through A1's escort police cell phone.

3. The learned Counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused would submit that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 05.03.2026; that the petitioner did not involve in this case incident as alleged by prosecution; the petitioner is the wife of A1; there is a delay in filing FIR; that criminal cases are also pending against the defacto complainant; A2/petitioner is not directly involved in previous case and she was included only by virtue of being the wife of A1; the petitioner has two children and there is no one available to take care of them; that if she is released on bail she will abide the conditions of this Court and that she may be released on bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that both A1 and petitioner/A2 contacted the defacto complainant through cell phone of the escort police and also threatened him not to give evidence in a murder case; co-accused also abating to threaten the material witnesses in a murder case; in this regard departmental enquiry is always initiated against the escort police personnel; the petitioner already involved in one previous murder case incident; that if she is released on bail, she will abscond, she will tamper the witnesses and that the petition may be dismissed.

5. Upon hearing both side arguments and as per FIR averments, it is seen that, at the time of alleged incident, the accused persons namely A1 and petitioner/A2, threatened the defacto complainant not to give evidence in a murder case, otherwise, they will murder him through their associates/co-accused. Further, it is specifically stated that A1 involved in several cases incidents, including murder case and the petitioner who is wife of A1 is also having one murder case in her credit. Investigation is pending.

Considering the nature of offence, previous bad antecedent of the petitioner, serious objections on the prosecution, stage of investigation and

in the interest of justice, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

6. In the result, the bail petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in open Court, this the 18th day of March, 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Perambalur.