



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **22.10.2025**

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

**CRL.O.P.No.22973 of 2025**

1.Vinothkumar  
2.Kani @ Kanimozhi

... Petitioners

Versus

State rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
Valangaiman Police Station,  
Thiruvarur District.  
(Crime No.210 of 2024)

... Respondent

**Prayer:-** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest by the respondent police in Crime No.210 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.A.Pragadeeswaran for  
Mr.J.Hemakumar

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udaya Kumar,  
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

### **ORDER**

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 294(B) & 506(1) of IPC, in Crime No.210 of 2024 seek anticipatory bail.



2.The allegation against the petitioners is that they jointly collected a sum of Rs. 3 lakhs from the defacto complainant under the pretext of securing a government job for the defacto complainant's son. However, they neither procured the job nor returned the money, thereby cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners did not collect any money as alleged by the defacto complainant and that they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the FIR was registered in the year 2024 and hence prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners are husband and wife. He further submitted that the amount involved is Rs.3 lakhs and that they failed to return the money and did not secure any government job as promised. He also submitted that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners as well as the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and perused the materials available on record.



7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in

(a) 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, everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;**

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;



WEB COPY



(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(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]*; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

22.10.2025

drl

To

1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,  
Valangaiman

2. The Inspector of Police,  
Valangaiman Police Station,  
Thiruvavarur District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.

**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

drl



WEB COPY



**CRL.O.P.No.22973 of 2025**

**22.10.2025**