



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 05.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

Rajarathinam Govindasamy

Petitioners

Vs

1. The State of Maharashtra Rep.by
The Superintendent of Police,
Chandrapur District.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Bramhapuri Police Station,
Chandrapur District.
Maharashtra-441 206
(Crime No.654 of 2025)

3.State of Rep. By,
The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli.

4.The Inspector of Police,
Thillainagar Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli.

Respondents



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

For Petitioners: Mr.S.Venkatesh

For Respondents: Mr.S.S.Manoj
Government Advocate (Criminal side)

Prayer: This petition is filed to enlarge the petitioner on transit anticipatory bail in the event of arrest at the hands of the respondents 1 and 2 through third respondent in connection with Crime No.654 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent.

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondents 1 and 2 police for the offences punishable under Sections 120B, 294, 326, 342, 387 and 506 of IPC and Sections 39 and 44 of Maharashtra Money Laundering (Regulation) Act, 2014, in Crime No.654 of 2025 on the file of the first respondent police, seeks interstate anticipatory bail.

2. The petitioner had been accused of non-bailable offences committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction limit of the State of Tamil Nadu, has approached this Court for anticipatory bail, so as to enable him to approach appropriate Court.



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant had obtained loan of Rs.1,00,000/- from A1 on 02.02.2021 for providing medical treatment to his cattle and had obtained loans from the A2 to A6 to repay the loan obtained from A2 from time to time to the tune of Rs.9,15,000/- and that the said A1 to A6 demanded huge interest on the loan and forcibly recovered a sum of Rs.48,53,000/- and further threatened the defacto complainant to pay money. Hence, a case has been registered.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. There is no specific allegation against this petitioner and the allegations are vague. Hence, they seek interim anticipatory bail for the petitioner to enable him to approach the appropriate Court and seek regular anticipatory bail. He further submits that this Court, in similar circumstances, granted interim anticipatory bail to the accused to enable him to seek appropriate bail orders from the concerned Court.



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

WEB COPY

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondents.

6. The issue as to whether, in respect of the persons, who have been accused of a non-bailable offence, committed beyond the territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, and if his arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that he is a resident of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail under Section 482 of BNSS, came up for consideration before a Division Bench of this Court in the case of ***S.P.Shanthi Swaroop v. State of Tamil Nadu, rep. By Asst. Commissioner of Police, Central Crime Branch, Madras*** reported in ***1992 L.W.(Crl.) 475***. After elaborate discussion, decisions and considering the ratio laid down by the Patna High Court in ***Syed Safrul Hassan v. State***, the Division Bench has passed the following order :

“For the foregoing reasons, we hold that the High Court or the Court of Session has got power under Section 438 Cr.P.C. To grant anticipatory bail irrespective of the locale of the Commission of the offence. In other words, in respect of persons who have been accused of a non-bailable offence committed beyond the



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

territorial jurisdiction of the State of Tamil Nadu, if their arrest is sought within the jurisdiction of this Court, irrespective of the fact that they are residents of the place over which this Court can grant anticipatory bail. However, we wish to observe that while granting anticipatory bail, this Court has to restrict the relief for a limited period and to direct the concerned persons to move the Court which is having jurisdiction over the matter in the meantime and also impose such condition so as to make the petitioner available for interrogation by the concerned police in the meantime. The reference is answered accordingly.”

7. Thereafter, a learned Single Judge of this Court in the case of ***P.Thangavelu and others v. State, rep. By the Inspector of Police and other*** reported in **2017 (2) MWN (Cr.) 633** has passed the following order :

“9.Thus, it is seen that though in the State of Uttar Pradesh, the provisions of [Section 438](#), Cr.P.C., enabling grant of Anticipatory bail has been deleted, still the Courts have power to grant Inter-State Anticipatory Bail, more particularly taking into account the provisions under [Article 21](#) of the Constitution of India. In the light of the above Judgments



and discussions, this Court is of the view that Inter-State Anticipatory Bail can be granted to the petitioner for a limited period to enable them seek appropriate Bail Orders from the concerned Court.

10. Accordingly, Interim Anticipatory Bail is granted to the petitioner herein till 01.08.2016. The petitioners are directed to be enlarged on Bail in the event of their arrest or on their appearance before the Judicial Magistrate concerned, subject to the following conditions:

(i) Each petitioner shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.10,000- (Rupees ten thousand only) with two sureties, to the satisfaction of the Respondent-Police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the Magistrate concerned;

(ii) within the said period, ie., before 01.08.2016, the petitioner shall appear before the concerned Court of Jurisdiction and move for Anticipatory Bail before the said Court.

11. This Court makes it very clear that Interim Anticipatory Bail pertaining to Inter-State



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

disputes cannot be sought as a matter of right and it is purely the discretion of the Court in granting the same, considering the facts, circumstances and also the nature of offences. It is also made clear that this order, on being produced, shall be punctually observed and executed by all concerned.”

8. In view of the decisions cited supra, this Court is inclined to grant interim anticipatory bail to the petitioner for a period of one month. Accordingly, interim anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner for a period of one month. The petitioner is are directed to be enlarged on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance before the respondent police and on further conditions that :

(i) the petitioner shall execute a Personal Bond for a sum of Rs.25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the Police Officer, who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate, Tiruchirappalli;



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

(ii) within the said period, i.e, before 05.02.2026, the petitioner shall file an appropriate application before the concerned jurisdictional Court for pre-arrest/anticipatory bail.

[S.S.Y. J]
05.01.2026

vsg



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

WEB COPY

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Tiruchirappalli.
2. The Superintendent of Police,
Chandrapur District.
3. The Inspector of Police,
Bramhapuri Police Station,
Chandrapur District.
Maharastra-441 206
(Crime No.654 of 2025)
4. The Commissioner of Police,
Tiruchirappalli.
5. The Inspector of Police,
Thillainagar Police Station,
Tiruchirappalli.
6. The Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 99 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

vsg

Order made in
Crl.O.P(MD)No.99 of 2026

05.01.2026