



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 2436 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP No. 2436 of 2026

Basheer Ahmed
S/o Muhammed Farook,
No.327, Jagadeesan Nagar,
NGGO Nagar,
Chengalpet District - 603 001

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep.by, The Inspector of Police,
P1 Police station,
Pulionthope,
Chennai.
(Cr.No.428/2025)

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: To enlarge the petitioner on Anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Cr.No. 428/2025 on the file of the respondent pending investigation.

For Intervener:	Mr.Ansaline Beryl
For Petitioner(s):	D.K. Nepolean
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 318(4) and 351(3) of BNS in Crime No.428 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner herein is that the petitioner, by taking advantage of his official position as Sub Inspector, slowly collected money to the extent of Rs.25.48 lakhs from the shop of the de facto complainant between the period from 23.06.2024 and 20.01.2025, by way of Gpay and other banking transactions, however the petitioner has not come forward to return back the money and when the de facto complainant demanded back the money, he has threatened him with dire consequences and also issued cheques and on presentation of the issued cheques, they have also been dishonoured. Hence, it is a case of cheating and the complaint has been lodged.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has collected only a small amount and the de facto complainant has demanded an exorbitant amount and further he was only collected Rs.10 lakhs and more than that he has not collected any amount, some amount has been repaid. Therefore, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

4. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that the petitioner is not only cheated the de facto complainant after collecting the money but also threatened the de facto complainant with dire consequences, more particularly threatened the de facto complainant that he will register a false case against him and put him behind the bars. Hence, he 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 the case is under investigation, so far no amount is recovered and the investigation is pending. Hence, she opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the fact that a huge amount of Rs.25.48 lakhs have been collected and subsequently the petitioner has been threatening the de facto complainant and also the fact that the cheques have been issued, those cheques have also been dishonored, I am of the view that it is a case of cheating and the petitioner is not entitled to seek anticipatory bail without making any payment. Accordingly, this petition is dismissed.

MPA

04-02-2026



To

1.State Rep.by, The Inspector of Police,

P1 Police station,

Pulionthope,

Chennai.

(Cr.No.428/2025)

2.The Public Prosecutor

High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 2436 of 2



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

MPA

CRL OP No. 2436 of 2026

04-02-2026