





WEB COPY

2. The petitioner is not an accused in Crime No. 16 of 2025 for the offence under Sec.66 D of I.T. Act,2008 and 318(4), 111(2)(b) B.N.S. He was arrested on 04.10.2025 and released on bail on 28.10.2025 by an order passed in Crl. M.P.No. 2322 of 2025, inter alia on condition that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders; that the petitioner appeared before the respondent police only on 06.11.2025; that thereafter, he failed to appear before the respondent police: that the respondent therefore filed a petition for cancellation of bail in Crl.M.P.No. 2545 of 2025 before the learned Sessions Judge and that the learned Sessions Judge allowed the said petition and cancelled the bail granted to the petitioner directing the petitioner to surrender before the Judicial Magistrate-II, Ariyalur forthwith.


3. The learned counsel for petitioner would submit that the petitioner had met with an accident; that since he could not move, he was unable to comply with the condition; that considering the said fact the impugned order may be set aside; that he is prepared to abide any stringent condition that may be imposed by this court.



4. The learned Public Prosecutor, per contra, would submit that the petitioner refused to receive the notice issued by the court in the petition filed for cancellation of bail; that notice had to be affixed in the door of the petitioner's house; that the petitioner had produced forged medical record making it appear that he was hospitalised and that therefore, the learned judge was justified in cancelling the bail.

5. It is seen from the impugned order that the petitioner had produced a forged medical certificate said to have been issued by one Dr.Amalan to make it appear that he met with an accident and he is undergoing treatment in hospital and that when the respondent made enquiry, it was found that the said Dr.Amalan had not issued any such certificate. The learned Judge in the order has quoted the statement made by the said Dr.Amalan to the respondent. The petitioner had complied with the condition only one day. Considering the conduct of the petitioner and the fact that he has attempted to mislead the court by producing a fake medical certificate, this Court is of the considered view that the learned judge was justified in cancelling the bail granted to the petitioner. There is no infirmity in the order passed by the learned Principal Sessions Judge, Ariyalur in Crl.M.P.No.2545 of 2025. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. The petitioner shall comply with the direction issued by the learned Principal Sessions Judge.

**08-01-2026**



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

WEB COPY

RPP

To

1. The Principal Sessions Judge, Ariyalur
2. The Inspector of Police,  
Cyber Crime Police Station, Ariyalur.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 2886 of 2



**SUNDER MOHAN J.**

**RPP**

**CRL RC No. 2886 of 2025**

**08-01-2026**