



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 1835 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 11-02-2026**

CORAM

**THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

**CRL OP No. 1835 of 2026**

Dinesh K D

S/o.Divakaran,

Kaithavalapil House, Maravanchery,

Chengaloor P.O., Thrissur District,

Pudukkad, Kerala.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep by

The Inspector of Police,

R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,

Arcot Road, Vadapalani,

Chennai - 600026.

Cr.NO.210/2024

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: To grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the event of his arrest in Cr.No.210 of 2024 pending on the file of respondent herein and thus render justice.

For Intervener:

Mr.P.G.Kugan

For Petitioner(s):

K.Aravind

For Respondent(s):

M/S.J.R.Archana

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



## **ORDER**

The petitioner, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 406 & 420 of IPC in Crime No.210 of 2024, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation levelled against the petitioner herein is that the petitioner has received a caravan (vehicle) for the purpose of using it for cinema shootings and an advance of Rs.4 lakhs was paid and it is also stated that they agreed between them profit earned by letting out the caravan would be shared between the petitioner and the de facto complainant. However, the petitioner neither returned back the vehicle nor returned the money. Hence, the complaint has been lodged.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that there is an agreement entered into between the petitioner and the de facto complainant as early as in the year 2019 and it is a partnership agreement entered into a business of purchasing and letting out the caravan and accordingly the petitioner has also paid a sum of Rs.1.70 lakhs. Subsequently the vehicle was taken away by the de facto complainant to Kerala and sold it and demanded further money from the petitioner herein. The vehicle is valued at Rs.12 lakhs. All the material facts have been suppressed by the defacto complainant in the complaint.



Therefore, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that the vehicle is yet to be recovered and a huge amount by way of rent is to be paid by the petitioner herein and if he is released on bail there is no possibility of recovering the money. Hence, opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that already the de facto complainant has also lodged a complaint before the Kerala Police and it was also investigated and the case has been closed, by suppressing the above facts this complaint has been lodged as if the petitioner herein has received the vehicle on rental basis and investigation is pending. However, she opposed granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. I have gone through the records and other connected materials, it revealed that as early as 2019 there was an agreement between the parties, now it is stated that the vehicle has also been taken away by the de facto complainant and there is also an earlier complaint lodged by the petitioner and there is suppression of earlier complaint, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner with certain conditions.



7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the **learned Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai**, on condition that **the petitioner shall execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only)**, with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further condition:

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

(d) 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 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 v. State of Kerala [(2005) AIR SCW 5560]*;



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 1835 of 2



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

**11-02-2026**

MPA

To

1. The Chief Metropolitan Magistrate Court, Egmore, Chennai.

2. State Rep by

The Inspector of Police,

R-8, Vadapalani Police Station,

Arcot Road, Vadapalani,

Chennai - 600026.

Cr.NO.210/2024

3. The Public Prosecutor,

High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 1835 of 2



**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

**MPA**

**CRL OP No. 1835 of 2026**

**11-02-2026**