



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6824 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 08.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 6824 of 2026

Saravanan @ Mankatha

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Valandur Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.28 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Santhanam Rajesh Kumar
Advocate.

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

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 28 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 140(2), 308(4) of BNS, in Crime No.28 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6824 of 2026

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant purchased an Auto by arranging loan through the first accused for a sum of Rs.2,75,000/-.

Thereafter, he sold the same to the first accused for a sum of Rs.2,10,000/-. The first accused had only given a sum of Rs.2,00,000/-. Thereafter, on 25.03.2026, he kidnapped the defacto complainant along with four other accused persons. Thereafter, on knife point he demanded Rs.5,00,000/- from him and grabbed Rs.1,50,000/- and threatened him to give the remaining amount within three days and released him. After three days, the defacto complainant along with some two other persons went to the spot as stated by the first accused and caught hold him and handed over to the respondent police. 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. There is previous dispute between the petitioner and the defacto complainant. After three days only the complaint was lodged. Hence, there is a delay in lodging the complaint. There is no specific overt act has been mentioned against the petitioner. The petitioner is only friend of first accused. The name of the petitioner was not mentioned in the FIR. There is no previous case pending against the petitioner. Co-accused was released on anticipatory



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6824 of 2026

bail. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (CrI. Side) fairly submits that the offences are grave in nature. Due to previous enmity, the first accused along with other accused kidnapped the defacto complainant and at the knife point, they grabbed a sum of Rs.1,50,000/- from him. There is money dispute between them. All the accused were present in the place of occurrence. Investigation is still pending 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, and the petitioner is not the named accused in the FIR, there is a money dispute between the first accused and the defacto complainant, co-accused was also released on anticipatory bail and that there is no previous case 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



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.6824 of 2026

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,**

Usilampatti 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 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.

(P D B J)
08.04.2026



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6824 of 2026

WEB COPY

- To
- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Usilampatti.
 - 2.The Inspector of Police,
Valandur Police Station,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.28 of 2026)
 - 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.6824 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 6824 of 2026

Date : 08.04.2026