



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 27.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.29161 of 2025

1. M/s.Ugra Technical and Engineering Company,
Represented by its' Proprietor,
Mr.L.Venkatesh,
S/o.Lakshmi Narayanan

2. L.Dinesh

3. Lakshmi Narayanan

... Petitioners

Vs.

State Represented by
The Inspector of Police
Team EDF-II,
Central Crime Branch,
Avadi Police Commissionerate,
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054.
(Crime No.Not Known of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in Crime
No.Not Known of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners	: Mr.P.K.Ganesh
For Intervenor	: Mr.R.Thamaraiselvan
For Respondent	: Mr.S.Udayakumar
	Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



ORDER

The petitioners herein, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 61(2), 316 and 351 of BNS, in Crime No. Not Known of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the first petitioner is a Sole Proprietorship, received the materials from the defacto complainant for a value of Rs.61.25 lakhs and the defacto complainant able to recollect only Rs.23.50 lakhs and remaining Rs.37.75 lakhs has not been paid by the petitioners. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent persons, and the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case; He would further submit that the dispute is with regard to default in payment for business transactions and everything is borne out of records, and in any case, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required and sought anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor would submit that the petitioners 2 and 3 by using the company name / A1, with the intention of cheating the de facto complainant, approached the defacto complainant and



collected huge value of the property and subsequently failed to pay the money. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that an FIR was registered only recently; that investigation in this case is still pending and, accordingly, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Heard both sides including counsel for Intervenor and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, that the 1st petitioner is the Proprietorship, that the disputes involved herein is non payment of money for the materials supplied, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 2 & 3 with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners 2 and 3 are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of ten days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Poonamallee**, 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 petitioners 2 & 3 fail to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of ten 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 petitioners 2 & 3 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 petitioners 2 & 3 in accordance with law as if the aforementioned conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 2 & 3 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.



9. As far as the first petitioner, it is a sole proprietorship, hence the petition filed by the sole proprietorship is not maintainable. Hence, petition filed by the first petitioner is dismissed.

27.10.2025

kmm

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court No.I, Poonamallee.
2. The Inspector of Police
Team EDF-II,
Central Crime Branch,
Avadi Police Commissionerate,
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054.
3. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

Crl.O.P.No.29161 of 2025

27.10.2025