



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

DATED: 08.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

Jahubar Ali

.. Petitioner/ Sole Accused

Vs

1. The State Rep.by,
The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime,
Chinaganajam Police Station,
Bapatla District,
Andhra Pradesh State.
(Crime No.162/2024).

2. State of Rep. By,
The Inspector of Police,
Nagudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.

.. Respondents

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Aruljenifer

For Respondents : Mr.A.S.Abul Kalaam Azad
Government Advocate (Criminal side)

Prayer: This petition is filed to enlarge the petitioner for interim anticipatory bail for offences under Section 318(4) of BNS, Act, and Section 66(D) of IT Act, in Crime No.162 of 2024 on the file of the 1st



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

respondent police.

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 318(4) of BNS, and Section 66(D) of IT Act, Crime No.162 of 2024 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.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner previously resides at Malaysia for avocation and working at a provisional shop. In that situation the 1st respondent received a complaint against the petitioner in acknowledgment number 30212240027781 dated 11.12.2024 regarding illegal transaction of Rs.75,000/- deposited in the petitioner's account. In that regard the petitioner's banker issued notice to the petitioner to



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

enquiry with the 1st respondent police. Subsequently, the 2nd respondent on one occasion over phone has persuaded petitioner to appear before the 1st respondent. As of now, the petitioner came to India on leave and the petitioner received a notice of appearances dated 23.12.2025 issued by the 1st respondent. Hence there is apprehension of arrest.

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.

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



WEB COPY

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 ***12352 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 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



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

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 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



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

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 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, Aranthangi;

(ii) within the said period, i.e, before 08.02.2026, the petitioner shall file an appropriate application before the concerned



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

jurisdictional Court for pre-arrest/anticipatory
bail.

08.01.2026

PJL

Note: Issue order copy on 12.01.2026.

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate,
Aranthangi.
2. The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime, Chinaganajam Police Station,
Bapatla District, Andhra Pradesh State.
(Crime No.162/2024).
3. The Inspector of Police,
Nagudi Police Station,
Pudukkottai District.
4. The Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD) NO. 235 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

PJL

Order made in
Crl.O.P(MD)No.235 of 2026

08.01.2026