



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.23431 of 2025

A.Vinoth Anand

... Petitioner

Versus

State rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch – II (CCB-II),
Coimbatore City Police.
(Crime No.16 of 2025)

... 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.16 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.Thayumana Sundaram

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

For Intervener : Mr.A.Saranraj

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 420 and 506(1) of IPC, in Crime No.16 of 2025 seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2.The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner/A3 had assisted A1 and A2 in selling the land in favour of the defacto complainant by suppressing various judicial proceedings pertaining to the property belonging to A1. It is further alleged that, as a result of such act, the defacto complainant suffered a loss to the tune of Rs.28,73,500/-. Hence, the present complaint has been lodged against the petitioner by the defacto complainant.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner has not aware of the judicial proceedings pending regarding the land and he is ready to co-operate with investigation. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervener submits that the petitioner along with other accused had cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.28.50 lakhs and that no amount has been repaid so far. He further submitted that none of the accused were arrested and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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



execute a bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only), with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

(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 petitioner 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 petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioner 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the 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) 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

WEB COPY

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.VI,
Coimbatore.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch – II (CCB-II),
Coimbatore City Police.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl



WEB COPY



CRL.O.P.No.23431 of 2025

(2/2)

22.10.2025