WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 28-10-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE N.RAMESH

CRL OP No. 26669 of 2026

CNR: {HCMA011998802026}

Arul Prakash

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep By, The Inspector of Police
Sankari Police Station
Salem District.
(Crime No. 60 of 2026)

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of arrest in Crime No.60 of 2026 on the file of the Respondent and thus render Justice.

For Petitioner(s): Mr. C.Deepakkumar
For Respondent(s): Mr. R. Rajasekaran, Government Advocate

ORDER

The petitioner herein apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 296(b) and 351(2) of BNS in Crime No.60 of 2026, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he, in concert with the other accused, approached the defacto complainant for the purchase of a lorry belonging to him for a total sale consideration of Rs.25,50,000/- and paid a sum of Rs.3,00,000/- as advance. Subsequently, the accused failed to pay the balance sale consideration and also did not come forward to return the lorry. Upon enquiry, it was revealed that the accused had cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that this is the third anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner and that the earlier petitions were dismissed by this Court. He further submitted that the sale agreement was entered into only between A2 and the defacto complainant and that the petitioner had neither received nor collected any amount from the defacto complainant. He also produced a copy of the sale agreement in support of his contention and prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that, though the sale agreement was executed between A2 and the defacto complainant, the petitioner had actively participated in the commission of the offence. He further submitted that the lorry has not yet been recovered and, therefore, opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent Police and perused the materials available on record.

6. This is the third anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner. The grounds now urged before this Court had already been considered while dismissing the earlier anticipatory bail petitions. No change in circumstances has been shown warranting reconsideration of the matter. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

28-10-2026

MPA
To
The Inspector of Police
Sankari Police Station
Salem District.
(Crime No. 60 of 2026)

2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

N.RAMESH, J.

MPA

CRL OP No. 26669 of 2026

28-10-2026

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis