



CRL OP(MD). No.5100 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 09/04/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.5100 of 2026

1. K.Rajagopal

2. M.Murugesan ... Petitioners/ Accused No.1 & 2

Vs

1. State of Tamilnadu Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
Periyakulam Police Station,
Theni District.

Crime No.328/2025. ... Respondent/Complainant

2. Padmavathi ... Respondent/Defacto Complainant

(R2 is suo motu impleaded as per order of this Court dated 13.03.2026 in Crl.OP(MD)No.5100 of 2026 by KKRKJ)

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.328/2025 on the file of the respondent Police.

For Petitioners : M.Arjun Varman,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kottaichamy,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : Mr.M.Jegadeesh Pandian

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the



CRL OP(MD), No.5100 of 2026

respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 406 & 420 of IPC, in Crime No.328 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that at the instance of the first petitioner, the defacto complainant joined a business in the name and style of 'MI Life Style Marketing'. On 10.03.2023, the petitioners received a sum of Rs.9,00,000/- from the defacto complainant on giving a false promise that they would secure a government job. Thereafter, they neither secured a job nor repaid the amount. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that no amount was received in their accounts and even in the legal notice sent by the defacto complainant, he admitted the fact that he invested the amount of Rs.9,81,000/- in the business. Since it was not satisfactory, he demanded the money back and created a new story of job rocketing. Apart from that, the alleged occurrence took place on



CRL OP(MD), No.5100 of 2026

11.01.2023 and FIR was registered on 03.11.2025. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that the allegation against the petitioners is grave in nature and huge money involved in this case. Hence, they strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel for the Intervener would submit that the second petitioner is a very influential person and they promised to secure a job for the daughter of the defacto complainant. When the amount was demanded by the defacto complainant, they threatened him with dire consequences. 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 on either side and the nature



CRL OP(MD), No.5100 of 2026

of offences charged against the petitioners, and there is a dispute between the parties with regard to MLM Business and even as per the prosecution, the alleged occurrence took place on 11.01.2023 and FIR was registered on 03.11.2025 and there is a delay in registration of FIR and already legal notice exchange between the parties and the petitioner already paid the part of the amount and though the FIR has been registered in the year 2025, the respondent police has not taken any steps to secure the accused and no previous case is pending as against the petitioners, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[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 **Judicial Magistrate Court, Periyakulam**, 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



CRL OP(MD), No.5100 of 2026

WEB COPY

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

(P D B J)
09.04.2026

dss



CRL OP(MD), No.5100 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

dss

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court,
Periyakulam.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Periyakulam Police Station,
Theni District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

ORDER
IN

CRL OP(MD) No.5100 of 2026

Date : 09/04/2026