



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12661 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 14.05.2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL.OP.No. 12661 of 2026

Sudarshan Dhanushkodi

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police
State Cyber Crime Investigation,
Ashok Nagar,
Chennai.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: The Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 483 of B.N.S.S. to enlarge the petitioner on bail, registered in the Crime No. 50 of 2026 pending investigation before the respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.K.A.M.Jagadish Kumar

For Respondent(s): Mr.V.J.Priyadarsana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 15.04.2026 for the offences punishable under Sections 138, 143(1)(d), 316, 318 of BNS, Sections 10, 24 of the Engineering Act 1983 and Section 66D of Information Technology Act, 2008 arising out of Cr. No.50 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that, on 12.04.2026, while conducting routine online patrol through media, a job advertisement template describing job opportunities in Combodia was found circulating on whatsapp. The same was shared on Facebook by one of the victims who had allegedly been cheated through the said advertisement. Upon preliminary investigation, it was revealed that one Sivakumar had acted as a recruitment agent facilitating the movement of people to scam compounds in Combodia and Vietnam. It is further alleged that, on 14.04.2026, the victims were trafficked through Chennai Airport. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the co-accused has already been released on bail. He further submits that the petitioner acted as a travel agent and he has no connection with the present case. He further submits that there is no previous case to the credit of the petitioner. The petitioner is under judicial custody since 15.04.2026. He further submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Therefore, he prayed to grant bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that under the pretext of securing jobs to the victims, the accused persons trafficked them through Chennai Airport. However, four of the victims were rescued in Chennai, Airport. The specific overt act against the petitioner is that he assisted



the victims to obtain Visa and Passport and if the petitioner is released on bail, he may abscond and would commit similar kind of offences in future as well.

He further submits that the petitioner has no previous cases pending against him. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of the offences and the petitioner acted only as a travel agent and the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner and also taking note of the fact that there is no previous case pending against the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial XI Metropolitan Magistrate at Saidapet** and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent Police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which she is suspected;



[d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

WEB COPY

[e] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.2023.

14.05.2026

Note:

1. Registry is directed to forthwith upload this order in the Official Website of this Court.
2. All concerned to act on this order being uploaded in Official Website of this Court without insisting on certified hard copies. To be noted, this order when uploaded in the official website of this Court will be watermarked and will also have a QR code.

rap



To

1. The Inspector of Police
State Cyber Crime Investigation,
Ashok Nagar,
Chennai.

2. The Judicial XI Metropolitan Magistrate at Saidapet.

3. The Superintendent,
Central Prison Puzhal, Chennai.

4. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 12661 of 2



P.DHANABAL, J.

rap

CRL OP No. 12661 of 2026

14.05.2026