WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 11.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 9789 of 2026

1.Mansoor Ali @ Mohammed Manzoor Ali
2.Hasim Bismi @ Hazeem
3.Jeyasudha
4.Shanuja @ Sanooja ...Petitioners/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Thiruvattar Police Station,
Thiruvattar – 629 177
Kanniyakumari.
(Crime No. 141 of 2026) ...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.V.J.Kumaravel
Advocate.
For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian
Counsel for State of TN (Crl.Side)
For Intervenor : Mr.T.Hubertson

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 141 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 296(b), 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 in Crime No. 141 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the third petitioner, who is working in a finance company run by the petitioners 1 and 2, after knowing the financial need of the defacto complainant, approached the defacto complainant and induced her to pledge the jewels in the third respondent's finance company. Believing his words, the defacto complainant pledged 434.400 grams and obtained loan of Rs.25,11,250/-. When the defacto complainant went to the finance company to redeem the jewels, the petitioners demanded exorbitant interest for the loan and refused to return back the jewels and threatened the defacto complainant.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that the petitioners 1 and 2 were already arrested and released on bail. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 3 and 4.

4. The learned Counsel for State of TN (Crl.Side) would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 296(b), 351(2) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita, 2023 r/w Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 in Crime No. 141 of 2026. He would further submit that already A1 and A2 were arrested and released on bail. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the defacto complainant obtained loan by pledging her jewels and thereafter, when they are ready to redeem the jewels by repaying the money, the petitioners refused to return back the jewels and they demanded more interest. A1 and A2 are running pan broker shop and the A3 is the friend of the defacto complainant and she is working in the finance company of A1 and A2. The fourth petitioner personnally came to the house of the defacto complainant and stated that they obtained licence for pan broker and assured to provide loan at lower interest than other finance institutions and thereby, the defacto complainant pleadged the jewels weighing 434.400 grams and obtained loan of Rs.25,11,250/-. When the defacto complainant ready to close the account by paying money, they demanded exorbitant interest and also failed to return back the jewels. Therefore, lodged a complaint and based on the complaint, the present petition has been registered and investigation is pending. There are several cases pending against the petitioner for the same kind of offences. Therefore, he prayed to dismiss the anticipatory bail petition.

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

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, and considering the facts that even according to the prosecution, the petitioners 1 and 2 were running pan broker shop and the third petitioner is working in that financial institution and the fourth petitioner is the wife of the first petitioner and the main allegations are as against the petitioners 1 and 2 and there are no specific allegations as against the petitioners 3 and 4 and there are no allegations that the petitioners 3 and 4 are involving in the day-to-day affairs of the financial institution and the main accused/A1 and A2, during pendency of this peittion, remanded and thereafter released on bail, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 3 and 4, subject to the following conditions:

> [a] Accordingly, the petitioners 3 and 4 are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Padmanabapuram, Kanyakumari, on condition that the petitioners 3 and 4 shall execute a bond for a sum of

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate concerned and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners 3 and 4 shall report before the respondent police, on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of four weeks, and thereafter as and when required for the interrogation.

[c] the petitioners 3 and 4 shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioners 3 and 4 shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioners 3 and 4 shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners 3 and 4 in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 3 and 4 released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

SCW 5560].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

8. As far as the petitioners 1 and 2 are concerned, as they were already arrested and released on bail, this petition is dismissed. As far as the petitioners 3 and 4 are concerned, this petition is allowed.

(P D B J)
11.06.2026

apd

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate-II,
Padmanabapuram, Kanyakumari.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Thiruvattar Police Station,
Thiruvattar – 629 177
Kanniyakumari.

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 9789 of 2026

Date : 11.06.2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis