



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No.21836 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.21836 of 2025

Radhakrishnan @ Udhayakumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by

The Inspector of Police,

CCB Salem City Police Station,

Salem District.

... Respondent

(Cr.No.17 of 2025)

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 by the respondent police in Cr.No.17 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.


For Petitioners : Mr.M.Mohamed Yasin

For Intervenor : Mr.B.Vasudevan

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 120B, 406, 418, 465, 420, 506(i) of IPC in Crime No. 17 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY



2. The case of the prosecution is that petitioner was one of the partners in a partnership firm namely M/s.ALA Apparels and the defacto complainant was also a partner in the said firm. It is alleged that for the purpose of availing loan for the said firm, the defacto complainant has come forward to mortgage his property and according to him, he mortgaged his property only for a sum of Rs.30 lakhs whereas without the knowledge of the defacto complainant, his property was mortgaged for a sum of Rs.3,90,000/- and subsequently, it was revealed that defacto complainant was cheated. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submits that the loan amount was disbursed only through the account of the partnership firm and the defacto complainant was aware about the total mortgage amount of Rs.3,90,000/-. He submits that by suppressing the fact that amount was disbursed only through the account of the partnership firm, a false complaint has been lodged as if the defacto complainant had mortgaged his property only for a sum of Rs.30,00,000/-. He also submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions 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.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that FIR was registered recently on 05.07.2025 and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that though the defacto complainant was approached other persons for getting a loan of Rs.30,00,000/- without his knowledge, his property was mortgaged and it was later revealed that the petitioner along with other accused shared huge amount among themselves thereby, cheated the defacto complainant. However, it is admitted by the learned counsel for the intervenor that the entire loan amount was disbursed only through the account of the partnership firm namely M/s.ALA Apparels. He further submits that the accused persons have taken away huge amount from the said account. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, submissions



WEB COPY

made by learned counsels on either side, on perusal of the materials placed on record, it is seen that the property was mortgaged for the purpose of availing loan of Rs.3.90 crores and the said amount was deposited in the account of M/s.ALA Apparels, in which the defacto complainant is the partner. If there is mismanagement of funds in the partnership firm, the appropriate remedy would be different than lodging a criminal complaint. In view of the same, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.

8. 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 which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.5, Salem** 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;



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.21836 of 2020

[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 two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[d] On breach of any of the aforementioned 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.



Crl.OP.No.21836 of 2025

09.10.2025
(2/2)

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.5, Salem
2. The Inspector of Police,
CCB Salem City Police Station,
Salem District.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

nr



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.21836 of 2025

Crl.O.P.No.21836 of 2025

09.10.2025