



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

WEB COPY

Dated : 09/06/2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

Vinita Nitin Mokal @ Vinita Nitin Mohan

... Petitioner/ Accused No.2

Vs

The State of Tamilnadu Rep By,
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch, Trichy,
Cr.No.17 of 2025.

... Respondent/ Complainant

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.17 of 2025 on the file of the
respondent police.

For Petitioner : Yogeswaran S,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervener : Mr.S.Ramsundarvijayaraj

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 318(4), 316(5) and 61(2) of BNS, 2023, in Crime No.17 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is a Joint Secretary of Non-Delta Farmers and Rice Mill Federation. The accused persons received a sum of Rs.2,18,40,000/- from the defacto complainant by entering into an agreement with the defacto complainant that they would export wheat by procuring the same from the farmers. Thereafter, they neither export wheat nor repaid money. On repeated demands, to discharge their debt, they issued a cheque and the same was returned with an endorsement 'insufficient fund'. Thereby, the accused cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent and she was falsely implicated in this case and she has no way connected in the above said incident. He would further submit that the allegation as against the petitioner is that after the



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

agreement, a part of the amount has been transferred to the account of this petitioner and apart from that, there is no allegation against the petitioner and already the main accused was granted bail. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that the accused persons cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.2,18,40,000/- and the amount involved in this case is huge amount and the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposes to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. He would further submit that already a part of the amount was repaid.

5. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner on the ground that the petitioner along with other accused cheated the amount of Rs.2,18,40,000/- and based on the agreement, they agreed to supply wheat. But, after receipt of entire amount, they neither export any wheat nor repaid money.

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



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioner, and even according to the prosecution, there was a agreement only between A1 and the defacto complainant and the allegation as against the petitioner is that after the agreement, a part of the amount has been transferred to the account of this petitioner and apart from that, there is no allegation against the petitioner and already the main accused was granted bail and the alleged occurrence was took place on 29.09.2024 and FIR was registered only on 16.07.2025 very belatedly and by this time, the material part of the investigation might have been completed, 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 bail in the event of arrest or on his appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Trichy**, 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 concerned and



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

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.



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

09.06.2026

WEB COPY
dss

To

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



WEB COPY



CRL OP(MD). No.10557 of 2026

P. DHANABAL,J

DSS

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10557 of 2026

Date : 09/06/2026