



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

WEB COPY

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 07.05.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MRS. JUSTICE S.SRIMATHY

CRL OP(MD)No.8613 of 2026

C.Santhanaraj

... Petitioner/ A3

Vs

The State, Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
South Police Station,
Thoothukudi.
(Crime No.492 / 2026)

... Respondent/Complainant

For Petitioner : Mr.K.Jerish Neeraj

For Respondent : Mr.E.Antony Sahaya Prabahar
Additional Public Prosecutor

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :- For Anticipatory Bail in Crime No.492 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 police



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2) and 318(2) of the B.N.S., 2023, in Crime No.492 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant's father is carrying on a finance business in her name, and the de-facto complainant had appointed her cousin (A1) to assist in maintaining the accounts. On 10.04.2026, the de-facto complainant visited her office, removed a five sovereign gold chain worn by her, and kept the same on the office table. She, however, forgot to take the chain while leaving the office, and upon returning shortly thereafter, found the chain missing. On enquiry, A1 gave an improper response and left the Office. Upon verification of the account books, the de-facto complainant noticed misappropriation of a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- and also found that certain articles, including sarees and night dresses worth Rs.10,000/-, were missing. It is alleged that A1 had handed over the said amount to A2 and A3, and that A2 and A3 had lent the same to customers of the de-facto complainant and earned profits therefrom. Hence, the complaint.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready and willing to abide by any conditions which may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he seeks anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor submitted that the present case involves serious allegations of misappropriation and criminal breach of trust in respect of the finance business carried on in the name of the de-facto complainant. It is submitted that the de-facto complainant had entrusted the accounts to A1, who is her cousin, and on verification, a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- has been misappropriated along with missing valuables including sarees and night dresses. It is further submitted that A1 had routed the said amount through A2 and A3, who in turn had utilised the same for lending to customers of the complainant and derived profit therefrom. Hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for unearthing the full conspiracy and tracing the misappropriated amount. Accordingly, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

WEB COPY

5. This Court, on considering the rival submissions and the materials placed on record, finds that the dispute arises out of financial transactions within a family setting, wherein the petitioner is alleged to have been involved in the chain of handling the funds. The allegations, as projected, primarily relate to misappropriation of money and missing articles, and the same are supported by documentary transactions which are already in the custody of the complainant.

6. This Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioner may not be necessary at this stage, as the primary evidence appears to be documentary in nature and is already available with the prosecution. Hence, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, subject to certain conditions.

7. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, on condition that the petitioner shall 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, Thoothukudi, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

copy was made ready and on further conditions that:

[a] the petitioner and the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhaar card or bank pass book to ensure their identity;

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of one week and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

[c]the petitioner shall not tamper with the evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

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

[e]On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned 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 is 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



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

[(2005)AIR SCW 5560].

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

(S S Y J)
07.05.2026

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
South Police Station,
Thoothukudi.
2. The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.8613 of 2026

S.SRIMATHY, J.

smn2

**ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD)No.8613 of 2026**

07.05.2026

Page 7 of 7