



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6705 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 09.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 6705 of 2026

A.Dhandraj

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Sattur Taluk Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.85 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.CM.Arumugam
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.P.Solai Samy

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 85 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 for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2) of BNS, in Crime No.85 of



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6705 of 2026

2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant purchased a Ashok Leyland Vehicle namely Dhosth with the assistance of the petitioner. Thereafter, on 15.08.2025, at about 07.00 a.m., the defacto complainant went his factory and found the above said vehicle missed. On the suspicion upon the petitioner, the present complaint has been lodged by the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the 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. Since the defacto complainant is the relative of the petitioner, he assists him to purchase some vehicles to run his fire works factory. Thereafter, due to the financial crisis, he closed the factory and he himself has lawfully repossessed the vehicle to the petitioner. Now to escape from the repayment the defacto complainant has lodged the instant complaint. The earlier complaint lodged by the defacto complainant was closed by advising the parties that since the dispute is civil in nature, they have to approach appropriate civil forum. Thereafter, the present complaint has been lodged again. The alleged



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6705 of 2026

occurrence is dated 15.08.2025. Since the respondent police compelled him to surrender the vehicle, he surrendered the same and now the vehicle is with the respondent police. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the intervenor seeks adjournment for filing petition.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the dispute is also civil in nature. There is a dispute between the parties with regard to the purchase of the parties. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner. However, the petitioner has no previous case.

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

6. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, there is a dispute between the parties with regard to the purchase of vehicle, the occurrence is dated 15.08.2025, the present FIR has been registered on 21.03.2026, there is no previous case pending against the petitioner and now the vehicle has been surrendered by the petitioner before the concerned police and also considering all the facts and



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6705 of 2026

circumstances of the case, 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 No.II, Sattur, Virudhunagar District**, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police, at 10.30 a.m., on every Saturday, for a period of four weeks, thereafter, as and when required for interrogation;

[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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6705 of 2026

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

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Sattur.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
Sattur Taluk Police Station,
Virudhunagar District.
(Crime No.85 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6705 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 6705 of 2026

Date : 09.04.2026