



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED : 24.07.2025**

WEB COPY

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR**

**Crl.O.P.No.10888 of 2025**

T.K.Velumani

.. Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch,  
Salem District.  
(Cr.No.3 of 2023)

.. Respondent

**PRAYER:** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to release the applicant on bail in the event of his arrest by the police in Crime No.3 of 2023 on the file of the Inspector of Police, District Crime Branch, Salem District.

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vijayasundar

For Respondent : Mr.Leonard Arul Joseph Selvam,  
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



## **ORDER**

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 120(B), 408, 420, 477(A) and 506(i) of Indian Penal Code, 1860, in Crime No.3 of 2023, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The contention of the petitioner is that the petitioner is the owner of the Sriram Weigh Bridge. The case projected against the petitioner is that though the petitioner had manipulated the weighbridge receipts favouring A1 and A2, and thereby they had committed misappropriation and cheating to the tune of Rs.1,49,97,340/- to the de facto complainant in the betel nut business. Originally, the case was registered in Crime No.3 of 2023 on 13.02.2023 against A1 to A3. Thereafter, by way of alteration report, the petitioner and two other employees, namely A4 to A6, have been included on 11.01.2025. The alteration report confirms that the hard drive had been seized and the earliest ticket numbers have been sent for forensic examination. The petitioner is a school dropout, and it is A5 and A6 employees who had computer knowledge and who had been handling the



weighbridge, and further custodial interrogation is not required. He is ready to cooperative with the investigation hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

3. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent Police while opposing the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner submits that the de facto complainant's son was looking after the betel nut farm and the petitioner's son died during the covid period on 16.04.2021. A1 and his brother are the Managers who look after the farm. A2 also died during December 2021. The petitioner had approached the de facto complainant, stating that they would look after the business and collect the betel nut and thereafter sell it in the wholesale market and pay the de facto complainant. Believing the same, the de facto complainant had entirely entrusted the work to A1 and his brother. A2 in this case is a purchaser of betel nut. A3 is the son of A2, and A4 is the weighbridge owner. A5 and A6 are his employees. In this case, apart from making corrections in the tickets, the vouchers have been prepared by A1, which has been authenticated and signed by the petitioner, giving a lesser weight



than the original weight as recorded in the computer weighbridge. This reduces and shows the harvest at a lesser rate. A1 and A2, as well as this petitioner and others, have benefited from the misappropriation of the different amounts. Further, the amount of misappropriation of cheating is to the tune of Rs.1,49,97,340/-. Hence, custodial interrogation is necessary.

4. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and submissions made by the learned counsels on either side, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

5. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

**24.07.2025**

cda



WEB COPY

Crl.O.P.No.10888 of 2



To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court No.VI, Salem.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch,  
Salem District.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,  
Madras High Court, Chennai.



WEB COPY

CrI.O.P.No.10888 of 2



**M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.**

cda

**CrI.O.P.No.10888 of 2025**

**24.07.2025**