



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3357 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 26.02.2026

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.3357 of 2026

C.Ashok Kumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep. By,  
Inspector of Police  
District Crime Branch Police Station,  
Krishnagiri District.  
Crime No.3 of 2026

... Respondent

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.3 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

|                 |   |                                                        |
|-----------------|---|--------------------------------------------------------|
| For Petitioners | : | Mr.C.Srinivasan                                        |
| For Intervenor  | : | Mr.C.Prabakaran                                        |
| For Respondent  | : | M/s.J.R.Archana<br>Government Advocate (Criminal Side) |

### **ORDER**

The petitioner herein apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 471 of IPC in Crime No.3 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he is arrayed as A2 in this case and had colluded with A1 in selling a lorry as if it belonged to A1, whereas in fact it belonged to a third party. After collecting a sum of Rs.40,00,000/-, the vehicle was handed over to the defacto complainant. Subsequently, the original owner came and took back the lorry. Hence, the case has been registered against the petitioner and others.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner acted only as a broker and had collected only the brokerage amount. He submitted that the petitioner had not demanded any amount from the defacto complainant towards the sale consideration. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to cooperate with the investigation and prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the Intervenor reiterated the prosecution case and vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case He further submitted that the petitioner had collected a sum of Rs.3.77 lakhs as brokerage and was well aware of the intention of A1. It is alleged that both A1 and A2 colluded



Crl.O.P.No.3357 of 2026

and collected money from the defacto complainant, thereby cheating him.

Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. I have also gone through the records and the connected materials, which reveal that the petitioner actively participated in the sale of the lorry, though it did not belong to A1. They collected Rs.40,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and cheated him. In such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

**26.02.2026**

Vv

To

1. The Inspector of Police  
District Crime Branch Police Station,  
Krishnagiri District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.3357 of 2026

**K.RAJASEKAR, J.**

Vv

**Crl.O.P.No.3357 of 2026**

**26.02.2026**