



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

CRL OP Nos. 22556 of 2025 and 3074 of 2026

Karthick @ Karthik
S/o. Selvam, D.No. 64/3,
Chairman Madurai Street,
Shevapet,
Salem – 636002.

Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No. 22556 of 2025

Prabhu
S/o.Mani,
No. 8/20EA/2,
Kattukottagai,
Pudupalayam road,
Rasipuram Post - 637 408,
Rasipuram Taluk,
Namakkal District.

Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No. 3074 of 2026
Vs

Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Salem City.
Crime No. 18 of 2025

..Respondent in both
Crl.O.Ps.

COMMON PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner herein on Anticipatory bail in the event of arrest in Crime No. 18 of 2025 on the file of respondent and pass such further or other orders as this Hon'ble Court may deem fit and proper in the circumstances of the case .



WEB COPY



For Petitioner in
Crl.O.P.No.22556/2025:

Dharani Thirunavukkarasu

For Petitioner
in Crl.O.P.No.3074/2026: Marudhachalamurthy Ramakrishnan
Marudhachalamurthy Ramakrishnan

For Respondent in both
Crl.O.Ps: Mr.P.Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

COMMON ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 120b, 406, 417 and 420 of IPC in Crime No.18 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police seek anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they fraudulently obtained a loan by submitting a forged No Objection Certificate and duplicate documents, falsely representing that the previous loan liability had been cleared. It is further alleged that they obtained a loan of Rs.25 lakhs in the name of the defacto complainant's company and shared the amount among themselves without the knowledge or consent of the defacto complainant. When the defacto complainant came to know about the forgery and questioned the same, the petitioners did not offer any explanation. Hence, the complaint has been lodged.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.22556 of 2025 submitted that the defacto complainant is the employer of the petitioners and,



according to the prosecution, the first petitioner is alleged to have misappropriated a sum of Rs.46 lakhs. It is the specific submission of the petitioner that he was not involved in the offence and that the occurrence took place on 24.07.2025. At this stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is not required. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.3074 of 2026 submitted that there is no serious allegation against him and that the only allegation is that he fabricated the No Objection Certificate. He submitted that he did not fabricate any such certificate and that such certificates are issued by the company, in which he has no role. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side), appearing for the respondent police, strongly opposed the petition and submitted that the first accused has already deposited a sum of Rs.31 lakhs and that the remaining misappropriated amount is only Rs.15 lakhs. He further submitted that the investigation is in progress. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) for the respondent, and perused the materials



available on record.

7. Taking into consideration the totality of the circumstances, including the registration of the FIR on 24.07.2025 and the repayment of Rs.31 lakhs by A1, this Court is of the view that, at this stage, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not required. Hence, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail, subject to certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before **the learned Judicial Magistrate-V, Salem**, on condition that **the petitioner shall execute a separate bond for a sum of Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand only)**, with **two sureties** each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned, and on further conditions:

(a) If the petitioners fails to surrender before the concerned Magistrate within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, this order shall stand automatically cancelled;

(b) The sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the application for surety ship (Judicial Form No.46 annexed to 'The Criminal Rules of Practice, 2019']. The learned Magistrate shall obtain a copy of any one of identify



proofs to ensure their identity;

(c) The petitioners shall sign before the respondent police twice a day at 10.30 a.m., and 5.30 p.m., until further orders and no relaxation petition will be entertained for a period of 30 days.

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

(e) If the petitioners thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS Act.

24-03-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

MPA



CRL OP Nos. 22556 of 2025 & 3074 of 2



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

MPA

To

WEB COPY

1. The Judicial Magistrate-V, Salem.
2. Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Salem City.
Crime No. 18 of 2025
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.

CRL OP Nos. 22556 of 2025 and 3074 of 2026

24-03-2026