



CrI.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.06.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

CrI.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

Selvaraju

... Petitioner

Vs

The State Rep by its,
Inspector of Police,
Adiyamankottai Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.
Crime No.162/2025.

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in
the event of arrest a case in Crime No.162 of 2025 on the file of the
respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Gnanasoundari

For Respondent : Mr.R.Vinothraja

Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent
Police for the offences punishable under Sections 318(2) of BNS, 2023 in
Crime No.162 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks



Crl.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that A1 and petitioner/A2 are moneylenders and A3 was working in Shriram Finance Company. In guise of getting loan for Rs.25,00,000/-, the accused obtained the original title deeds of the defacto complainant and his father and also blank cheques and papers. Instead of Rs.25,00,000/-, the accused arranged loan for a sum of Rs.8,00,000/-, of which, only Rs.5,45,000/- was given to the defacto complainant. Despite making several request for return of original documents, the accused failed to do so. Hence, the complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has nothing to do with the alleged offence and a false case foisted against him for statistical purpose. The petitioner neither received any blank cheque nor any blank promissory notes from the defacto complainant. When the defacto complainant requested for money, the petitioner introduced the other accused for arrangement of loan. Hence, she prays for anticipatory bail.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the



Crl.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

respondent Police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that since the defacto complainant unable to bear any further, he committed self immolation in the office of Superintendent of Police on the grievance day. Due to burn injuries, the defacto complainant died on 04.06.2025. Hence, he strongly opposed for anticipatory bail.

5.Considering the submissions and on perusal of the materials, it is seen that petitioner/A2 and A1, who are moneylenders and A3, who is working in Shriram Finance Company, had promised the defacto complainant to arrange loan of Rs.25,00,000/- and collected the original title deeds of defacto complainant and his father. Instead of Rs.25,00,000/-, the accused arranged loan for Rs.8,00,000/-, of which only Rs.5,45,000/- was given to the defacto complainant. When the defacto complainant sought for return of original documents, the accused failed to do so. Hence, the defacto complainant approached the respondent Police on several occasions, but the respondent Police were shying away their responsibilities by giving one reason or other. The defacto complainant unable to bear any further and he had fought the might and muscle power of the accused and finally, he committed self immolation on the grievance day in the office of Superintendent of Police and died on 04.06.2025 due to burn injuries.



Crl.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

WEB COPY6. In view of the plight of defacto complainant, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

27.06.2025

vv2

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Adiyamankottai Police Station,
Dharmapuri District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY



CrI.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

vv2

CrI.O.P.No.17649 of 2025

27.06.2025