



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 15.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

L.Meenatchisundaram

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch-II,
Dindigul.
(Crime No. 12 of 2026)

...Respondent

For Petitioner : Mr.M.Vivek Bharathi
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.H.Lakshmi Shankar

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 12 of 2026 on the file of the
respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 329(4), 351 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 3 and 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 in Crime No. 12 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that there is a money transaction between the defacto complainant and the accused. The defacto complainant borrowed a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- from A1 and executed a mortgaged deed in favour of A2. After paying entire loan, redeemed the mortgaged property. However, on 08.09.2020, A1 demanded more interest to the tune of Rs.10,00,000/- and for security purpose, a sale agreement was executed between the parties in favour of A2 and further sale deed was also executed for security purpose only. However, A2 settled the said property in favour of his son/A3 by way of a gift settlement deed. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he is no way connected in the above said incident. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Hence, he prayed to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that the defacto complainant executed the sale deed in favour of A2 for the security purpose only and however, A2 fraudulently executed the gift settlement deed in favour of A3. Hence, he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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 316(2), 381(4), 329(4), 351 of BNS, 2023 and Sections 3 and 4 of the Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 in Crime No. 12 of 2026. He further submits that there is a money transaction between the parties and the petitioner has no previous case. He would further submit that the investigation is pending and the offences are grave in



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

nature and hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

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 petitioner, and considering the facts that there is a money transaction between the parties and even according to the prosecution, the alleged occurrence took place on 02.09.2021 and however, the complaint was lodged only on 16.03.2026 and no previous case is pending against the petitioner, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is 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 Judicial Magistrate-II, Dindigul, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

police, daily at 10.30 a.m. until further orders.

WEB COPY

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

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

[e] the petitioner 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 petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner 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.

apd

(P D B J)
15.04.2026
(2/2)



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

To
WEB COPY

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-II, Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch-II,
Dindigul.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 5828 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 5828 of 2026

Date : 15.04.2026
(2/2)