



CRL MP No. 6288 of 2



CrI.O.P.No.1026 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-06-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL MP No. 6288 of 2026

in

CrI.O.P.No.1026 of 2026

M.S.Pazhani,
S/o.Saminathan,
D.No.2, Mottur Village,
Madarahalli Post,
Pochampalli Taluk, Krishnagiri District.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. The State rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
Kandili Police Station,
Thirupathur District.

2. R.Sangeetha
D/o.Rajendran,
No.18/a, Vedhachalam Nagar 1st Street,
Housing Board Colony, Near District Collector
Office, Kancheepuram.

..Respondent(s)

Criminal Miscellaneous Petition filed under Section 528 of BNSS
2023, praying to cancel the bail granted to the 2nd respondent by this Court in
CrI.OP.No.1026 of 2026 dated 19.01.2026.

For Petitioner(s):

M/S.E.Kannadasan

For Respondent(s):

Mr.N.Palanivel,
Government Advocate (CrI.Side) for R1



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 6288 of 2



CrI.O.P.No.1026 of 2026


Mr.S.Shanmugavelayutham,
Senior Counsel
for M/s.R.T.Vijayaraaghavan for R2

ORDER

This Criminal Miscellaneous Petition has been filed seeking cancellation of the bail granted to the second respondent by this Court in CrI.OP.No.1026 of 2026 dated 19.01.2026.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was a money transaction between the parties and, in furtherance thereof, the impugned FIR came to be registered. He further submitted that the second respondent was granted bail by this Court on 19.01.2026 in CrI.O.P.No.1026 of 2026.

3. It is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner that, after obtaining bail, the second respondent has not been cooperating with the investigation. However, the said contention was seriously disputed by the learned Senior Counsel appearing for the second respondent, who submitted that the second respondent has been cooperating with the Investigating Officer and has been duly complying with the conditions imposed by this Court. He further submitted that even according to the averments made in the affidavit filed in support of the petition, no grounds have been made out to establish violation of the conditions imposed in paragraph 6 of the bail order.



4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the first respondent also reiterated the said submission. At this juncture, it is also relevant to note that civil litigation in respect of the subject property is pending between the parties. It is a well-settled principle of law that bail is the rule and jail is the exception, and an order granting bail cannot be interfered with unless compelling circumstances are made out.

5. On consideration of the submissions made on either side, this Court is unable to find any valid ground to interfere with the order granting bail to the second respondent in Crl.O.P.No.1026 of 2026 dated 19.01.2026.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Miscellaneous Petition stands dismissed.

24-06-2026

cda

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
Kandili Police Station,
Thirupathur District.

2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL MP No. 6288 of 2



CrI.O.P.No.1026 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN J.

cda

**CRL MP No. 6288 of 2026
in
CrI.O.P.No.1026 of 2026**

24-06-2026