



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 24697 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.09.2025

CORAM

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

Crl.O.P.No. 24697 of 2025

S.Ramesh

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
The Inspector of Police,
M-6, Manali Police Station
Manali, Chennai
Crime No. 414 of 2025.

...Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed seeking to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No. 414 of 2025 on the file of the Inspector of Police, M6, Manali Police Station, Chennai.

For Petitioner : Mr.C.Paulkanagaraj
For Ms.Prema Sudha

For Intervener : Mr.K.Bommuraj

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No. 414 of 2025 registered for the offences punishable under Section 296(b), 316(2), 318(4), 351(3) of BNS Act, against the petitioner, the present petition has been filed



by the petitioner seeking anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner had leased out Flat Nos.S2, S3 and S5 belongs to him for various persons. In the meanwhile, the petitioner has come forward to sell the flats to the de-facto complainant. The de-facto complainant paid a sum of Rs.24,00,000/-. After receiving sale consideration, the petitioner has refused to execute the sale deed in favour of the de-facto complainant. When the de-facto complainant had approached the petitioner to execute the sale deed in favour of the de-facto complainant, the petitioner had threatened the de-facto complainant to kill him with dire consequences. Hence the case.

3. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that this is purely civil in nature and already there was an agreement entered into between the petitioner and the de-facto complainant. He further submits that an additional amount has to be paid by the de-facto complainant. He further submits that the family members of the de-facto complainant had given a complaint against the petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed



by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that the petitioner had involved in similar offences in Crime No. 413 of 2025 and the same is pending. He further submits that he had several complaints against the petitioner herein in similar in nature. Hence, he strongly opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Counsel for the Intervener/De-facto complainant submitted that a huge amount has been received by the petitioner herein from the de-facto complainant and others. After receiving money, he has refused to hand over the possession to the de-facto complainant. He further submits that the petitioner borrowed huge amount from various persons with regard to the aforesaid flats. Several complaints were lodged against the petitioner by other persons. The respondent police registered several FIRs based on the complaint lodged by other victims and the same are pending. He further submits that an undertaking had entered into between the petitioner and the de-facto complainant is forged one and the same has



not been recorded before this Court. After receiving huge amount, the petitioner had failed to execute the sale deed in favour of the de-facto complainant.

6. On perusal of records, it reveals that the petitioner had already leased out the Flat Nos.S2, S3 and S5 belongs to him to various other persons. In the meanwhile, the petitioner wants to sell the flats to the de-facto complainant. The de-facto complainant paid a sum of Rs.24,00,000/- to the petitioner to purchase the said flats. After receiving money, the petitioner has failed to execute the sale deed in favour of the de-facto complainant with regard to the aforesaid flats. Eventually, the de-facto complainant came to know that the petitioner had cheated various other persons. When the de-facto complainant had approached the petitioner to execute the aforesaid flats, the petitioner demanded more money and criminally intimidating to kill the de-facto complainant with dire consequences and the same has been revealed by way of earlier three complaints lodged against the petitioner. Though, it has been stated that at the behest of one person, a complaint has been registered, but in other two complaints are two different parties and the petitioner had intentionally



WEB COPY

cheated the de-facto complainant of Rs.24 lakh and now refused to hand over the flats and also threatened. If granted anticipatory bail, he will threaten the de-facto complainant and therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Considering the aforesaid facts and circumstances of the case, and the gravity of offences committed by the petitioner and the submissions made by the learned counsels on either side, considering the fact that the investigation in this case is yet to be concluded, at this stage, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

26.09.2025

MSM

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate, Thiruvottiyur.

5/6



Crl.OP.No. 24697 of 2025

The Inspector of Police,
M-6, Manali Police Station
Manali, Chennai
Crime No. 414 of 2025.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 24697 of 2025

MSM

Crl.O.P.No.24697 of 2025

26.09.2025