

Shanthi Vs The State represented by,

Shanthi Vs The State represented by,

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1418297

Court : Chennai Orders

Decided On : Jan-29-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Rajasekar

Appeal No. : CRL OP/1917/2026

Appellant : Shanthi

Respondent : The State represented by,

Judgement :

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 29.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Shanthi ... Petitioner Vs. State Rep., by The Inspector of Police, (Crime No.22 of 2026) ... Respondent PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Cr.No.22 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police. For Petitioners : Mr. V. Vijaya Kumar For Respondent : Ms. J.R. Archana Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 3(2)(a), 4(1), 5(1)(a) and 7(1)(a) of ITP Act in Cr.No.22 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is that the

petitioner is ranked as A2 in this case, she joined hands with other accused A1, rented the house and involved in running brothel business. Based on the secret information, the respondent police have searched the premises and three victims have rescued. A1 in this case was arrested and based on the statement of A1, the role of A2 was unearthed and added as an accused

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the

petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for

the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the three victims were rescued and that the investigation is pending in this case. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the

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

6. Considering the nature of the allegations, the fact that the

investigation is pending and based on the confession statement of the co-accused revealed this petitioner is also actively participated in the occurrence. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Vv To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Kancheepuram.

2. The Inspector of Police, 3.The Public Prosecutor High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com