



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.29665 of 2025

1. Syed Ismail
2. Akram Javeed ... Petitioners
Vs.

State, rep. By
Inspector of Police,
Salem Town Police Station,
Salem. ... Respondent
(Crime No.420 of 2025)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita of BNS, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime
No.420 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Rahul
For Intervenor : Mr.S.Mahaveer Shivaji
For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath,
Government Advocate (Crl. Side).

ORDER

The petitioners, who were apprehending arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 296(b), 351(2)
of BNS Act, 2023 and under Section 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of



Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 in Crime No.420 of 2025, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant, acquainted with the first petitioner since 2018, borrowed Rs.39,00,000/- for business needs and thereafter paid substantial sums towards interest. The petitioners are alleged to have demanded exorbitant interest and threatened the defacto complainant for non-payment of Rs.2,85,00,000/-. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He contended that that no exorbitant interest was ever demanded from the defacto complainant and that the allegations have been foisted to evade liability. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that a sum of Rs.2.84 crores has already been paid and that the petitioners are now



continuously demanding further amounts from the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the petitioners are attempting to unlawfully snatch away the share that rightfully belongs to the defacto complainant. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant bail to the petitioners.

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

6. I have also gone through the FIR and other materials. It reveals that the petitioners have already received Rs.29,00,000/- and demanded Rs.2.84 crores with interest, and even now they are continuously demanding further amounts. This clearly appears to be a case of charging exorbitant interest and harassing the defacto complainant. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

18.11.2025

kmm

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Salem Town Police Station,
Salem.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.29665 of 2025