



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.1724 of 2026

1.E.Venkatesan  
2.V.Pradeep  
3.V.Rogesh

... Petitioners

Versus

The State rep by its,  
The Sub-Inspector of Police,  
E-1, Ponneri Police Station,  
Redhills, Thiruvallur District.  
(Crime No.469 of 2025)

.. Respondent

**Prayer:-** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.469 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.Singaravelu Balaraman

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

### **ORDER**

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 316(2), 318(4) of BNS Act, in Crime No.469 of 2025 registered on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.



2. ⌚ The allegation against the petitioners is that they had induced the defacto complainant to part with a sum of Rs.11,00,000/- by falsely representing that they owned certain land, whereas the said land did not belong to them. It is further alleged that, despite receipt of the said amount, the petitioners failed to return the money and, though a cheque was issued towards repayment, the same was dishonoured. Hence, the present case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that there was no sale agreement entered into between the parties and that the petitioners never made any representation regarding the sale of land. According to the learned counsel, the transaction in question was purely a loan transaction, which has been subsequently given a criminal colour. He further submitted that legal notices have already been exchanged between the parties and that the petitioners are willing to cooperate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioners, despite not owning any land, falsely claimed ownership and collected a sum of Rs.11,00,000/- from the defacto complainant through various bank transactions. It was subsequently revealed that the representation made by the petitioners was false, thereby cheating the



defacto complainant. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.

6. Admittedly, a sum of Rs.11,00,000/- has been paid under various circumstances. However, there is no agreement placed on record to substantiate the allegation that the petitioners had agreed to sell land which did not belong to them. Further, it is also seen that legal notices have been exchanged between the parties. Considering the above facts and circumstances, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the *learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Ponneri* on condition that the petitioner shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand Only), each with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:



(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

**(b) the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation;**

(c) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(d) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(e) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/ Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners 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) AIR SCW 5560]*; and;

(f) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

**28.01.2026**

*drl*



WEB COPY

**To**

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I,  
Ponneri

2. The Sub-Inspector of Police,  
E-1, Ponneri Police Station,  
Redhills, Thiruvallur District.

3.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

drl

**CRL.O.P.No.1724 of 2026**

**28.01.2026**