



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 26.03.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

Sundarraaj

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Sub Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Virudhunagar
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No. 12 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Mariappan
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.B.Nambi Selvan
Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervenor : Mr.A.Karthigaivel

PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS

PRAYER :-



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

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

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.03.2026 for the offences punishable under Section 69, 318(4), 296(B), 351(3), 77 of BNS and Section 67 of Information Technology Act in Crime No. 12 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is working in Police Department and the petitioner and the defacto complainant have illegal intimacy and he has recorded video in his cell phone. In view of the relationship between them, the defacto complainant has given Rs.59,00,000/- to the petitioner, out of which Rs.30,00,000/- alone was repaid and remaining Rs.29,00,000/- was not repaid in order to cheat the defacto complainant and the petitioner threatened the defacto complainant on the strength of the video recorded in his cellphone. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

that the petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that regarding money dispute, already a case is pending before the learned Judicial Magistrate-II, Virudhunagar and so far, no cellphone was recovered by the respondent police. He would further submit that he has been arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 13.03.2026. Therefore, prayed to grant bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor would submit that in view of the relationship between the parties, the defacto complainant has given Rs.59,00,000/- to the petitioner in order to pay fees for the defacto complainant's daughter, who is studying abroad and however, without paying the fees, the petitioner has purchased a property by utilizing the said amount. When the defacto complainant asked about the same, the petitioner threatened her on the strength of the video. He would further submit that so far, Rs.30,00,000/- alone was repaid. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

respondent would submit that the petitioner has no previous case. He would further submit that the offences are grave in nature and hence, he strongly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

6. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the rival submissions made by the learned counsel on either side, nature of offence, and considering the relationship between the parties and there is a money dispute pending between the petitioner and the defacto complainant and so far, no cellphone was recovered and the petitioner has no previous case and also considering the period of incarceration undergone by the petitioner, this Court is inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on 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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

Magistrate-II, Virudhunagar, and on further conditions that:

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

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/she is suspected;

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

[e] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence;

[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.



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

WEB COPY

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

(P D B J)
26.03.2026
(2/2)

apd
To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate-II, Virudhunagar.
- 2.The Sub Inspector of Police,
All Women Police Station,
Virudhunagar
Virudhunagar District.
3. The Superintendent, District Jail, Virudhunagar.
- 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 5888 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

apd

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 5888 of 2026

Date : 26.03.2026
(2/2)