



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No. 20167 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 25-09-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO. 20167 of 2025

and

Crl.M.P.No.15432 of 2025

Ramalu Reddy Sekar

Petitioner

Vs

The State rep. by

The Inspector of Police

Sriperumbudur Police Station

Kancheepuram District.

Crime No. 50 of 2025.

Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 50 of 2025 on the file of respondent police.


For Petitioner : Mr.P.Senthilkumar

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar

Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 406 IPC in Crime No.50 of 2025 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner received a sum of Rs.7,26,500/- on 10.12.2021 and Rs.8,83,975/- on 12.03.2022 totalling Rs.16,10,475/- from the de-facto complainant by executing Demand Promissory Note and cheque leaves for the business purposes and to meet his urgent needs. Thereafter, the petitioner did not pay any principal or interest. Hence the complaint.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner was not able to repay the said amount due to financial constraint and the petitioner handed over the Promissory Note and cheque leave to the de-facto complainant. He also submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition that may be imposed by this Court and ready to furnish sufficient solvent sureties for his release. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that the petitioner had received a sum of Rs.16,10,475/- from the de-facto complainant for business purposes and to meet his urgent needs and



thereafter, the petitioner has failed to repay the said amount. However, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

5.The learned Counsel for the Intervener/de-facto complainant submitted that the petitioner had collected to the tune of Rs.16,10,475/- from the de-facto complainant under the guise of “high returns” and thereafter, he failed to repay the same, and the petitioner had cheated the de-facto complainant. Therefore, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Heard the learned counsels and perused the materials available on record.

7.Considering the submissions made by the learned Counsel on either side, considering the fact that there was some money dispute between them and no documents were produced by the de-facto complainant, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on



WEB COPY

which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur**, on condition that the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only)** with **two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:-

(a) If the petitioner fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate, within a period of fifteen days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

[b] the sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb Impression in the Application for Surety ship [Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of the identity proofs to ensure their identity;

[c] the petitioner shall report before the respondent Police daily at 10.30 a.m for a period of three weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[d] On breach of any of the aforementioned



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 20167 of 2025

conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to pass appropriate orders against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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)13 SCC 283]**;

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

[f] Connected Crl.M.P.No.15432 of 2025 is closed.

23.09.2025

MSM
To

1. **The Judicial Magistrate, Sriperumbudur.**

2. The Inspector of Police
Sriperumbudur Police Station
Kancheepuram District.
Crime No. 50 of 2025.

3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 20167 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

MSM

Crl.O.P.No. 20167 of 2025

25.09.2025