



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 30.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

P.Mohanakannan,
S/o.Santhi

...Petitioner/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
E-5, Mattuthavani Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.76 of 2026)

...Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Senthil Kumar,
Advocate.

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

For Intervenor : Mr.P.Bala Subramanian,
Advocate

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER : For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.76 of 2026 on the file of
the respondent police.



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

WEB COPY

The petitioner/accused, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), and 351(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.76 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the 1st accused is running a travel agency under the name and style of “HD Consultancy” at Madurai. The de-facto complainant, along with two others, approached the said agency for securing employment abroad. Upon consultation with the 1st and 2nd accused, the de-facto complainant paid a sum of Rs.6,00,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs only) to the 1st accused towards the entire visa process.

3. Thereafter, the de-facto complainant received a courier containing an agreement stating that he would be sent to Russia on a tourist visa, which would subsequently be converted into a work permit within a short period. Relying on the assurance given by the 1st accused, the de-facto complainant travelled to Russia. However, he was



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

apprehended by the Russian police, who warned him not to remain in Russia as he had entered the country on a tourist visa.

4. Subsequently, the de-facto complainant attempted to contact the 1st accused to inform her of the situation, but the 1st accused did not respond to his calls. Thereafter, after a few days, the Russian police again warned the de-facto complainant and sent him back to India. When the de-facto complainant approached the company of the 1st accused seeking return of the amount, he was allegedly threatened with dire consequences. Hence, the present case.

5. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and has been falsely implicated in this case, and that he is in no way connected with the alleged occurrence. He has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The learned counsel would further submit that the 1st accused in this case has already filed an undertaking affidavit before this Court to settle the amount to the de-facto complainant and two others. Hence, he prays for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner, along with other accused, is alleged to have cheated the de-facto complainant and others, and also have criminally intimidated them. Hence, he opposes the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Heard the learned counsel appearing on either side as well as the learned counsel appearing for the intervenor and perused the materials available on record.

8. Considering the rival submissions made on either side, the nature of the offences alleged against the petitioner, the fact that already the main accused in this case has already filed an undertaking affidavit before this Court to settle the amount to the de-facto complainant, this Court is 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) each



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

WEB COPY

with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.6, Madurai, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police once in a week i.e. on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

[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].



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can

WEB COPY be registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

(P D B J)
30.04.2026

mkn

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court No.6,
Madurai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
E-5, Mattuthavani Police Station,
Madurai District.
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No. 6730 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

mkn

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 6730 of 2026

Date : 30.04.2026