



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7542 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 17.04.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 7542 of 2026

Sundhar

... Petitioner

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.14 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Ramakrishnan
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.M.Karunanithi
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 14 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 316(1), 318(4) & 351(i) of BNS, in Crime No.14 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.7542 of 2026

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant running private dairy business. He approached the petitioner, who is the Assistant Manager of Yest Bank, Thillai Nagar, Trichy, for arranging loan for his business and on his advise the defacto complainant took out three insurance policies as well as paid the processing fees also. Thereafter, when he applied for the loan through online portal, the same was rejected stating that the petitioner has defaulted loan. Therefore, the defacto complainant demanded the petitioner to return the amount spent for insurance as well as processing fees. The same was refused by the petitioner. 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. The loan application of the defacto complainant was rejected only due to the previous defaulted loan in State Bank of India, Palani. The petitioner did not do any thing in this regard. The defacto complainant only applied the loan by suppressing the defaulted loan. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7542 of 2026

WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) fairly submits that the offences are grave in nature. There is a dispute between the parties regarding sanctioning of loan. Earlier a complaint was lodged before the Inspector of Police, Thillai Nagar, Trichy, later it was closed. Thereafter, the present complaint has been lodged before this respondent police. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner, since the investigation is still pending.

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, considering the dispute between the parties in respect of sanctioning of loan, according to the petitioner already complaint was lodged by the wife of the defacto complainant before the Thillai Nagar Police Station, Trichy and thereafter, the same was closed, thereafter, the present complaint has been lodged, even as per the FIR, the alleged occurrence took place in the year 2022 and the complaint has been lodged on 24.03.2026, and considering all other facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7542 of 2026

[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.I, Dindigul**, 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 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.O.P.(MD)No.7542 of 2026

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

registered under Section 269 B.N.S.

(P D B J)
17.04.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Dindigul.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul District.
(Crime No.14 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.7542 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 7542 of 2026

Date : 17.04.2026