



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.3691 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 13-02-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

CRL OP NO. 3691 of 2025

1. M. Mujeeb Rahman
2. T. Jeyakumar

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State of Tamil Nadu, Through the Inspector
of Police Saibaba Colony Police Station,
Coimbatore City. (Crime No.25 of 2025)

Respondent(s)

For Petitioner(s): Mr. C. Manishankar
(For Mr. R. Aravindan)

For Respondent(s): Public Prosecutor

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468, 506(1) and 120(B) of IPC in Crime No.25 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.3691 of 2023



2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and the first petitioner had entered into an agreement to market the products manufactured by the defacto complainant in the foreign countries by using the defacto complainant's Bar Code; that the business relationship between the defacto complainant and the first petitioner ended in the year 2023; that however, the first petitioner along with his manager, who is the second petitioner herein, illegally used the Bar Code of the products of the defacto complainant and supplied the products to a foreign buyer at Quatar, causing loss to the defacto complainant sustained loss. Hence, this case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case; that even if the allegation that the petitioners have used the bar code of the defacto complainant is true, no loss was caused to the defacto complainant; that the allegation at best reveals a breach of contract; that the alleged offence are borne out by records; that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required; and that the petitioner is ready to produce solvent sureties and to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court



and also undertake to appear and to co-operate for the investigation, and
prayed for anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and on instructions submitted that the defacto complainant sustained loss to the tune of Rs.1,50,00,000/-; and that the investigation is pending and opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.

6. Taking note of the facts and circumstances of the case, considering the nature of allegation against the petitioners, the fact that the allegation are borne out by records and since, custodial interrogation is not required, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.3691 of 202



7. Accordingly, the petitioners 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 No.VII, Coimbatore** on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of **Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each** for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed and on further condition that:

[a] the petitioners and the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity.

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation.

[c] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

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



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.3691 of 2025



[e] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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 SCW 5560].

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

13.02.2025

stn

To

1. The State of Tamil Nadu, Through
The Inspector of Police,
Saibaba Colony Police Station,
Coimbatore City.
(Crime No.25 of 2025)



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3691 of 2025

SUNDER MOHAN, J.

stn

Crl.O.P. No.3691 of 2025

13.02.2025