



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.02.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CrI.O.P.No.3354 of 2026

Raju @ Govindaraju

... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
Veppamkuppam Police Station,
Vellore District
(Cr.No.16 of 2026)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of
his arrest by the respondent police pending investigation in Crime No.16 of
2026 on the file of the respondent police and pass orders.

For Petitioner : Mr.D.Thirumoorthy

For Intervenor : Mr.M. Shimiyaon Edwin

For Respondent : M/s. J.R. Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



WEB COPY



ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 306 of BNS Act, 2023 (381 of IPC) in Crime No.16 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that this petitioner/A2 along with accused had taken the lorry belonging to the defacto complainant for the purpose of delivering rice in a mill situated at Manali. It is alleged that after delivering the rice the petitioner and other co-accused have received Rs.60,000/- as delivery charges and not paid the money and also not returned the lorry to the petitioner and thereby cheated the defacto complainant. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has received a hand loan of Rs.10,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and failed to pay the interest as well as the principal amount. He further submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case.



He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation and abide by any other stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that he has purchased the vehicle in question by availing the bank loan and he was not able to pay the installment amount. He further submitted that the petitioner has committed theft of the lorry and also cash to the tune of Rs.60,000/-, due to which the defacto complainant has sustained huge monetary loss. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of 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 petitioner along with other accused have committed theft of lorry belonging to the defacto complainant and also stolen cash of Rs.60,000/-. He further submitted that the petitioner acted as a cleaner of the lorry and so far the vehicle and the money was not yet recovered and investigation in this case is pending. Hence, she opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

6. Considering the submissions made by both sides; stolen property is not recovered and investigation in this case is pending, if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail he will hamper the investigation. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

18.02.2026

smn

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Veppamkuppam Police Station,
Vellore District

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

smn

Crl.O.P.No.3354 of 2026

18.02.2026

1/2