



WEB COPY

Crl.OP.No.33517 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 15.12.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.33517 of 2025

1.N.Sathikbasha
2.S.Balasubramanian

... Petitioners

Vs.

State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
Kandhikuppam Police Station,
Krishnagiri.
(Cr.No.223 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of
arrest pending investigation in Crime No.223 of 2025 on the file of the
respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Balasubramaniam

For Intervenor : Mr.S.Saravan

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under
Sections 191(2), 126(2), 296(b), 351(3), 318(4) of BNS in Crime No.223 of
2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners herein are A3 and A4 who are the land owners, come forward to sell the land to the defacto complainant for a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- and also collected the same and subsequently, they have not come forward to execute the sale deed as agreed between the parties. When the defacto complainant went to the place of the petitioner and demanded back for the registration of the same, these petitioners have threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequence. Hence, the complaint has been lodged.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any such offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that contrary to the allegations of the defacto complainant, there was no agreement whatsoever between A1 and the defacto complainant. He further submitted that the alleged transaction was taken place in the year 2012 and the complaint has been lodged recently. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the Intervenor reiterated the prosecution case and vehemently opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reported that the petitioners herein are A3 and A4 who are the land owners has come forward to sell the land to the defacto complainant for a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- and also collected the same and subsequently, they have not come forward to execute the sale deed as agreed between the parties. When the defacto complainant went to the place of the petitioner and demanded back for the registration of the same, these petitioners have threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequence. It is also reported that part of the amount is repaid to the petitioners. He further reported that the co-accused were enlarged on anticipatory bail vide order dated 26.11.2025 in Crl.OP.No.31950 of 2025. However, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. I have considered the submissions made on both sides and perused the materials available on record, which revealed that the alleged payment of money was taken place in the year 2012 and the FIR was lodged only in 2025, I am of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners in this case not necessary. Hence, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance within a period of fifteen (15) days



from the date on which the order copy made, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate-I, Krishnagiri** on condition that each of the petitioners shall execute separate bonds for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only) with two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition that:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) 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 identify proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) **The petitioners shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of two weeks and thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;**

(d) The petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(e) The petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial:

(f) On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate actions against the petitioners in accordance with law as if



Crl.OP.No.33517 of 2025

the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on anticipatory bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in ***P.K.Shaji v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]***;

(g) If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

15.12.2025

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Krishnagiri
2. The Inspector of Police,
Kandhikuppam Police Station,
Krishnagiri.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.33517 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.33517 of 2025

15.12.2025