



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 226 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 19-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 226 of 2026

1. Gowtham

2. Sankari

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep.by, The Sub Inspector of Police,
Virudanpet Police Station,
Vellore.

Crime No. 213 of 2025

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 482 of BNSS to grant anticipatory bail to the Petitioners /Accused no. 1,2 in Crime No.213 of 2025 in the event of arrest pending on the file of the Respondent police.

For Petitioner(s):

Ms.Sriraam

For Respondent(s):

Ms.J.R.Archana, GA (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offence,punishable under Sections 336(2), 338, 336(3), 340(2), 318(4) of the BNS in Crime No.213 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the defacto complainant is the owner of a shop premises situated at Gandhi Nagar, Vellore. The petitioners had taken the said premises on rent in December 2022 for the purposes or



running a seafood business. At the time of taking the premises on rent, a rental agreement was executed only for a period of two months and thereafter no further agreement was executed between the parties. Petitioners without the knowledge and consent of the defacto complainant, created a forged rental agreement and also used the same to obtain a loan of Rs.10,00,000/- from Indian Ban, Katpadi Branch in the name of GP Sea Foods. Petitioners also created another forged rental agreement and obtained a Mudra loan of Rs.10,00,000/- from the Bank of India, Katpadi Branch in the name of the Gowtham Sea Food in the name of his mother. Hence, the case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are innocent and have been falsely implicated. He further contended that the dispute between the parties is purely civil in nature. The petitioners undertakes to cooperate with the investigation and abide by any stringent conditions imposed by this Court. Therefore, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution's case. Upon instructions, she submitted that the petitioners cheated not only the de facto complainant but also the banking institutions through the fabrication of documents. She further stated



that the investigation is still in progress and argued that if the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail, there is a significant risk of tampering with evidence and hampering the investigation. Hence, she vehemently opposed the grant of bail.

5. Considering the nature of the allegations, the substantial sums of money involved, and the fact that the petitioners allegedly not only defrauded the de facto complainant but two others banks through the fabrication of documents, hence this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed

19-02-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

JAI

To

1. The Sub Inspector of Police,
Virudanpet Police Station,
Vellore.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 226 of 2



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

JAI

CRL OP No. 226 of 2026

19-02-2026