



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.4988 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 10.03.2026

PRESENT

The HONOURABLE Mr.JUSTICE. K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN

CRL.OP.(MD).No.4988 of 2026

Kamalakannan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Tamil Nadu,
Represented by the Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.03 of 2026)

... Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Poonachandran for Mr.T.Kanagaraj

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaisamy
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)

For Intervenor : Mr.S.Alagu Sundar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER in all cases :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No. 03 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER: The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(1), 318(3), 318(4), 351(1) of



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.4988 of 2026

BNS/ Sections 405, 420, 417, 375 of IPC in Crime No.03 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is the son of A1. He had business transaction with defacto complainant. As per business agreement, the defacto complainant, he entrusted more than Rs.10 crore for supplying of cardamom . A1 father on receipt of the above said amount only supplied the cardamom worth about Rs.7.24 crores. Remaining cardamom was not supplied. Hence, he made the complaint before the respondent police. Based on the complaint, the present case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is not involved in any such occurrence as alleged in the FIR. Except the allegation that the petitioner was the father of A1 and he was present at the time of handing over the Blank Cheque and giving assurance for the supply of remaining cardamom, there is no other allegation against the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl. side) appearing for the respondent strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner stating that the accused persons cheated the defacto complainant by



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.4988 of 2026

fraudulently receiving the amount without supplying the cardamom.

WEB COPY

5.The learned counsel for the intervenor reiterated the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side). He further submitted that the petitioner assured to pay the remaining amount. But, he did not do so. He neither repay the amount nor supply the goods.

6. Even as per the prosecution case, the A1 has business transaction with defacto complainant and he received the amount as alleged by the prosecution and it is the case as to whether A1 failed to supply the cardamom for Rs.3.08 crores, whereas they already sent the cardamom worth about Rs.7.24 crores. In view of the above nature of transaction, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7.Accordingly, this criminal original petition is allowed and the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, on condition that the petitioner shall 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 Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order made ready and on



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.4988 of 2026

further conditions that:

[a]the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity.

[b]the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m. for a period of fifteen days and thereafter, as and when required.

[c]the petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

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

[e]On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner is released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

[f]If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

8.This Court is confined the allegation made against A2 alone. It is not



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.4988 of 2026

be taken into consideration in respect of A1, while considering the bail petition,
if any.

10.03.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
DCB Police Station,
Dindigul District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.4988 of 2026

K.K.RAMAKRISHNAN,J

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.4988 of 2026

Date : 10.03.2026