



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 13.08.2026

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice K.MURALI SHANKAR

CRL OP(MD).No.17346 of 2026

K.Thangapandian

... Petitioner/
Accused No.2

Vs

State of Tamilnadu represented by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB-Madurai City,
Cr.No.25/2026

... Respondent/
Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.E.Satish Rajkumar,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian,
Counsel for Stae of TN
(Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Section 483 of B.N.S.S.

PRAYER :-

For Bail in Crime No.25 of 2026 on the file of the
Respondent Police.



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/A.2, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.07.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 120(b), 109, 465, 468, 471 and 408 I.P.C., in Crime No.25 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant - Jothi Housing and Mortgage Finance Limited lodged a complaint alleging that its former branch manager - N.Kannan - first accused colluded with the other borrowers to create bogus / forged documents overvaluing the properties to sanction loans in violation of rules and thereby causing financial loss to the company. It is the further case of the prosecution that the petitioner who is the second accused is alleged to have obtained a loan of Rs.19,41,232/- agaisnt the property in the alleged transactions and that all the accused persons have cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.1,63,45,029/-.



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. The learned Counsel for the petitioner / second accused would submit that the petitioner was a borrower / customer, that the first accused alone was vested with administrative responsibility to verify title deeds, inspect the property sites, issuance of valuation clearance and sanctioning of loans and that the second accused had absolutely no administrative power within the company, that the valuation of the properties and the legal scrutiny were conducted by the panel engineers and the panel lawyers officially appointed by the defacto complainant company and the petitioner/second accused had no role in generating official valuation certificates or approving the loan eligibility, that the defacto complainant company has already initiated recovery proceedings under the SARFAESI Act converting a purely civil recovery process into a criminal proceedings, that this Court has already granted anticipatory bail to some of the co-accused and the case as against one of the accused was already quashed, that since the entire case rested on the documentary evidence, there is no need



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

for custodial interrogation and that the learned Principal and Sessions Judge, without considering the above material aspects, has erroneously dismissed the bail petition and that therefore, the petitioner was constrained to approach this Court.

4. The learned Counsel for State of TN (Crl.Side) would submit that the petitioner / second accused is the king pin of the entire transaction and the offences levelled that the petitioner/second accused colluded with the first accused manager and committed all the illegal activities and caused severe loss to the company, that while the documents were verified for the purpose of initiating action under the SARFAESI Act, the defacto complainant came to know that it is a low value property belonging to Rajeshwari for which nominal sale deed was executed in favour of the seventh accused and the loan was received by fabricating false document and low value property was shown as high value property, that some of the accused are still absconding, that the investigation is still pending and they are having



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

WEB COPY

serious objections to grant bail to the petitioner/
second accused.

5. The learned Counsel for the intervenor - defacto complainant would submit that the petitioner/second accused and the manager / first accused colluded and conspired to usurp the company money and both of them jointly fabricated the documents, that the petitioner fabricated the Aadhaar card and voter's ID of one Pandiammal, who is a fictitious person and fabricated building valuation memo, income certificate in the name of the said Pandiammal and the same were submitted to the then manager / first accused, who inturn placed his signature, as if the documents were genuine, that the accused mortgaged the low value property and got loan amount of Rs.19,41,232/-, that some of the accused persons are relatives and with an evil intention, fabricated false documents and committed the offences, that since the petitioner/second accused is the main accused and the investigation is still



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

pending, is not entitled to get bail at this point of time.

WEB COPY

6. It is pertinent to note that according to the prosecution, another case in Cr.No.29 of 2026 came to be registered against the petitioner/second accused, wherein it was alleged that he had cheated to the tune of Rs.45,00,000/- by adopting the same modus operandi. It is the specific case of the prosecution as well as the defacto complainant that the petitioner/second accused in collusion with the first accused - the then manager of the company, colluded and conspired together and created /fabricated documents and that they had caused loss to the tune of Rs.1,63,45,029/-. It is the specific case of the defacto complainant that the petitioner /second accused had fabricated Aadhaar cards and voter's Identity card.

7. Considering the entire facts and circumstances and taking note of the nature and gravity of the offences alleged against the



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

petitioner/second accused and the quantum of amount involved and also taking note of the fact that the investigation is pending, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner at this point of time. Consequently, the Criminal Original Petition is devoid of merits and the same is liable to be dismissed.

8. In the result, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

(K M S J)

13.08.2026

SSL

TO

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court NO.1,
Madurai.
2. The Superintendent,
Central Prison,
Madurai.
3. The Inspector of Police,
CCB-Madurai City,
4. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.17346 of 2026

K.MURALI SHANKAR, J

SSL

ORDER IN
CRL OP(MD) No.17346 of 2026

Date : 13.08.2026