



CRL OP(MD). No.1669 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 09.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.1669 of 2026

Sheik Abdullah

...Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station
Dindigul District
(Crime No. 41 of 2025)

...Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Yasar Arafath

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy

Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 41 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No.1669 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner/Accused who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Section 318(4) of BNS in Crime No. 41 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that unknown person had contact the defacto complainant and stated that he had been placed under Digital arrest and that he if had not committed any offence he must transfer the money from his bank account to the bank accounts provided by them for verification of genuineness of the funds. He assured that after verification the money would be returned within 24 hrs. Believing the words the complainant had transferred a sum of Rs.50,00,000/- in three bank accounts and thereby cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and no previous case is pending against the petitioner. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

2/5



CRL OP(MD). No.1669 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that the petitioner had cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs. 50,00,000/- in three bank accounts. He would further submit that there are some money transactions in the account of the petitioner and the investigation is pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the gravity of offence and also the fact that the investigation is not yet completed and there are some transactions in the account of the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Hence the petition stands dismissed.

(P D B J)
09.04.2026

aav

3/5



CRL OP(MD). No.1669 of 2026

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
Cyber Crime Police Station
Dindigul District
- 2.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.1669 of 2026
P. DHANABAL, J

aav

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.1669 of 2026

Date : 09.04.2026