



2025:KER:62207

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE BECHU KURIAN THOMAS

MONDAY, THE 18TH DAY OF AUGUST 2025 / 27TH SRAVANA, 1947

BAIL APPL. NO. 8964 OF 2025

CRIME NO.412/2024 OF Pallickal Police Station, Thiruvananthapuram

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

APARNA NAIR
AGED 26 YEARS
D/O ANIL KUMAR AJITH BHAVAN , THRIKKAKKARA NORTH,
ERNAKULAM, PIN - 682033

BY ADV SHRI.SREEHARI INDUKALADHARAN

RESPONDENTS/STATE & COMPLAINANT:

- 1 STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, HIGH COURT OF KERALA,
PIN - 682 031
- 2 DISTRICT POLICE CHIEF
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM RURAL DISTRICT POLICE OFFICE PATTOOR
PMG RD, PALAYAM, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM, KERALA,
PIN - 695 033
- 3 THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER
PALLIKKALPOLICE STATION THIRUVANANTHAPURAM DISTRICT,
PIN - 695 306



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

2

BY ADV.SRI. NOUSHAD K. A. (PP)

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON
18.08.2025, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

3

BECHU KURIAN THOMAS, J......
B.A.No.8964 of 2025
.....**Dated this the 18th day of August, 2025****ORDER**

This bail application is filed under section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (for short 'BNSS').

2. Petitioner is the 2nd accused in Crime No.412 of 2024 of Pallikkal Police Station, Thiruvananthapuram, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 370, 120B and 420 r/w 34 of the Indian Penal Code, 1860 [for short, 'the IPC'].

3. According to the prosecution, the accused had, after falsely promising employment for two children of the de facto complainant, trafficked them to United Arab Emirates [for short 'UAE'] on a visiting visa and provided them an employment in the workshop of the father of the 3rd accused and thereafter, provided them an apartment and after hiding some contraband in the car, managed to rope in the children of



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

4

the de facto complainant in a crime under the Narcotic Drugs Statute of UAE and, had them arrested and imprisoned for 20 years and thereby committed the offences alleged.

4. Heard the Sri.Sreehari Indukaladharan, the learned counsel for the petitioner as well as Sri.Noushad K.A., the learned Public Prosecutor.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that petitioner has been falsely arrayed as an accused and that he has no involvement in the alleged crime and, therefore, he may be granted anticipatory bail.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor opposed the bail application and submitted that custodial interrogation is necessary.

7. In **Sushila Aggarwal and Others v. State (NCT of Delhi) and Another**, 2020 (5) SCC 1, it was held that while considering whether to grant anticipatory bail or not, Courts ought to be generally guided by considerations such as the nature and gravity of the offences, the role attributed to the applicant, and the facts of the case. Grant of anticipatory bail is a matter of discretion and the kind of conditions to be imposed or not to be imposed are all dependent on facts of each case,



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

5

and subject to the discretion of the court.

8. In the instant case, the prosecution has not been able to convince this Court of the necessity of custodial interrogation.

9. The petitioner is alleged to have, along with other accused, promised to provide an employment for the two children of the *de-facto* complainant and trafficked them to 'UAE' on a visiting visa and provided them an employment in the workshop of the father of the 3rd accused and implicated them in a narcotic drugs crime. By an order dated 23.06.2025 in B.A. No. 5275 of 2025, the accused 1 and 3 have already been granted anticipatory bail by this Court, after noticing that the offence of trafficking of persons is not seen to be *prima facie* attracted. A reading of the FIR does not indicate any serious allegation against the petitioner who is arrayed as the 2nd accused. The main allegations are raised against accused 1 and 3. Though there is an allegation of conspiracy between all the accused, already accused 1 and 3 have been granted anticipatory bail and hence there is no reason to deny pre-arrest bail to the petitioner. The learned public prosecutor pointed out that petitioner had sent an amount of Rs. 15,000/- to the daughter-in-law of the complainant, however, that by itself do not indicate any involvement



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

6

of the petitioner in the alleged crime of trafficking of persons. In such circumstances, I am of the view that the petitioner can be granted pre-arrest bail subject to conditions:-

Accordingly, this application is allowed on the following conditions:

(a) Petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer on 02.09.2025 and shall subject herself to interrogation.

(b) If after interrogation, the Investigating Officer proposes to arrest the petitioner, then, she shall be released on bail on her executing a bond for Rs.50,000/- (Rupees fifty thousand only) with two solvent sureties each for the like sum before the Investigating Officer.

(c) Petitioner shall appear before the Investigating Officer as and when required and shall also co-operate with the investigation.

(d) Petitioner shall not intimidate or attempt to influence the witnesses; nor shall she tamper with the evidence.



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

7

(e) Petitioner shall not commit any similar offences while she is on bail.

In case of violation of any of the above conditions or if any modification or deletion of the conditions are required, the jurisdictional Court shall be empowered to consider such applications, if any, and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, notwithstanding the bail having been granted by this Court.

Sd/-

BECHU KURIAN THOMAS
JUDGE

mus



B.A.No.8964 of 2025

APPENDIX OF BAIL APPL. 8964/2025

PETITIONER ANNEXURES

ANNEXURE A1	TRUE COPY OF THE FIR IN CRIME NO 412 OF 2024 OF PALLIKAL POLICE STATION DATED 01.06.2024
ANNEXURE A2	TRUE COPY OF THE INTERIM ORDER DATED 08.04.2025 IN B A 5275 OF 2025
ANNEXURE A3	TRUE COPY OF JUDGEMENT IN BA 5275 OF 2025 DATED 23.06.2025