



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

1.Vasudevan

2.Sekar

...Petitioners/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by

The Inspector of Police,

City Crime Branch

Trichy.

(Crime No. 37 of 2024)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.B.Jameelarasu
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.T.Lenin Kumar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 37 of 2024 on the file of the

1/7



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

respondent police.

WEB COPY

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 417, 420, 465, 468, 471, 506(1) and 109 of IPC, in Crime No. 37 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioners introduced one Govindrajan/A1 to the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant has given Rs.5 crores in order to purchase a property owned by one K.V.Rengasamy and to that effect, the said Govindarajan handed over a sale agreement as if the said K.V.Rengasamy has accepted the advance amount and thereafter, when the defacto complainant approached the said K.V.Rengasamy, the defacto complainant came to know that the sale agreement was forged. Thereby, the petitioners, after receiving Rs.5 crores, cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

they are no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that the petitioners are only introducers and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that A1/main accused was arrested and released on bail and the petitioners were granted interim anticipatory bail. Hence, he prayed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the petitioners and other accused were illegally received a sum of Rs.5 crores from the defacto complainant as if they are the owners of the subject property. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that based on the complaint given by the defacto complainant, a case has been registered for the offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 417, 420, 465, 468, 471, 506(1) and 109 of IPC, in Crime No. 37 of 2024. He would further submit that this is the second anticipatory bail application and the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in nature and



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

there is no change in circumstances and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions made on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, and considering the facts that there is a huge money transaction involved in this case based on the agreement in respect of the sale of property and even according to the prosecution, A1 received the money and these petitioners acted as introducer and though some transactions were made between the parties, it can be considered during the trial and the alleged occurrence took place during the year 2021-24 and however, the FIR has been registered only in the year 2024 and a cheque case is also pending between the parties and the main accused/A1 was also arrested and released on bail and these petitioners were also granted interim anticipatory bail, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

WEB COPY

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on anticipatory bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate, Srirangam, Trichy, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police, daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

[c] the petitioners shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

[d] the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

[e] the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

[f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in

WEB COPY

P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

8. Since the case is pending for a long time before the respondent police for investigation, the respondent police are directed to complete the investigation as early as possible without any delay preferably within a period of three (3) months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order.

apd

(P D B J)
10.04.2026
(2/2)

To

- 1.The District Munsif cum Judicial Magistrate,
Srirangam, Trichy.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
City Crime Branch
Trichy.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

6/7



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 3462 of 2025

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 3462 of 2025

Date : 10.04.2026
(2/2)