



WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 12.03.2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE **MR. JUSTICE K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN**

CRL OP (MD) .Nos.2352 & 2353 of 2026

B.Chandran Sekar

... Petitioner/Accused No.1
(In Cr1.OP (MD) No.2352 of 2026)

C.Arun Yogeshwaran

... Petitioner/Accused No.3
(In Cr1.OP (MD) No.2353 of 2026)

Vs

1.State of Tamilnadu Rep by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
CCB Police Station,
Madurai City.
(In Crime No.31 of 2025)

... Respondent/Complainant
(In both petitions)

2.B.Rajasekar ... Respondent/Defacto Complainant
(In both petitions)

(R2 is suo motu impleaded as per order of this
Court dated 06.02.2026 in Cr1.OP (MD) Nos.2352 & 2353
of 2026 bu SSYJ)



(In both petitions)

WEB COPY

For Petitioner : Mr.A.Arun Ramnath
for Mr.P.Subha Rani.

For R1 : Mr.P.Kottai Chamy,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For R2 : Mr.S.Vella Chamy

PETITIONS FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.483 of
BNSS

COMMON PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.31 of 2025 on
the file of the respondent police

COMMON ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A1 & A3, who apprehend arrest
at the hands of the respondent police for the
offences punishable under Sections 49, 296(b), 318(4)
and 351(3) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.31 of 2025, on
the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory
bail.

2. According to the prosecution, the petitioners
herein are the father & son and the defacto
complainant is the uncle of the petitioner in



WEB COPY
Crl.OP(MD)No.2352 of 2026, who is aged about 99 years. The petitioners forged the signature of the complainant and obtained loan of Rs.2.74 crore from the State Bank of India where A6 was working as Manager. Hence, the complainant gave a complaint. Based on that, the respondent police, registered a case in Crime No.31 of 2025 for the aforesaid offences. Hence, this petition.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have been falsely implicated in this case and they have not committed any offence. He further submitted that the complainant voluntarily gave a consent letter to obtain loan. After execution of the consent letter, now he turned around and retracted the statement. Hence, they also obtained the private hand writing opinion and the same was supported their case. Hence, he seeks this Court to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners stating that they forged the signature of the complainant, who is aged about 99 years and also the close relative. Apart from that, they obtained loan, conspiracy with the bank manager. As per the scheme, only after construction of the building and also completion of other stages can one run for the supply of equipment to be delivered. Without doing the same, the bank manager and the petitioners and also A5 conspired together and fraudulently misappropriated the fund more than one crore under the guise of supply of the machineries. Apart from that, it is a peculiar case and the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required in this case.

5. The learned counsel for the intervener has reiterated the submission of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) and submitted that the petitioners totally misappropriated the fund and



WEB.COM

cheated the complainant. But, not only forged the signature but also obtained loan amount without the knowledge of the complainant and without complying the loan condition, which requires the custodial interrogation of all the accused. Therefore, he sought for dismissal of the petitions.

6. This Court considered the rival submissions and perused the materilas available on record.

7. It is specifically alleged that the petitioner forged the signature of the complainant. Apart from that, the bank manager and the medical equipment Company and the petitioners conspired together and without complying the loan terms and obtained the loan amount of Rs.2.74 crores for supply of the medical equipment without construction of the building and other formalities. At this stage, it is necessary for the custodial interrogation of the petitioners in this case. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

8. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petitions



stand dismissed.

WEB COPY

9. The learned counsel for the intervener submitted that FIR was registered on 18.07.2025 and there was no progress in the course of the investigation.

10. Considering the same, this Court directed the respondent police to complete the investigation in Crime No.31 of 2025 as expeditiously as possible and the Commissioner of Police, Madurai, is directed to monitor the same and the Commissioner of Police, Madurai, is further directed to submit a periodical report relating to the investigation conducted by the respondent police before this Court till the filing of final report.

(K K R K J)

12.03.2026

dss



WEB COPY



TO

1. The Sub Inspector of Police,
CCB Police Station,
Madurai City.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN, j. ,



WEB COPY



dss

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) .Nos.2352 & 2353 of 2026

Date : 12.03.2026