



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.9184 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 02.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 9184 of 2026

1.Rengaraj
2.Rajkumar

... Petitioners

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Koodal Pudhur Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No.191 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.B.Bala Karthick
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.G.Ganesh Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. side)

For Intervenor : Mr.G.Karuppasamy Pandiyan

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 191 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 316(4), 318(4) and 336(3) of BNS, in



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9184 of 2026

Crime No.191 of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is running a Auto finance company. The petitioners are working there. On verification of accounts it was found that from June 2024, they did not maintain the account properly and misappropriated to the tune of Rs.7,00,000/- from the company. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the petitioners are innocent and they were falsely implicated in this case and they are in no way connected in the above said incident. They have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The petitioners are mere collection agents and they have no responsibility towards sanctioning, disbursement of loan and maintaining the accounts. The second accused is the Manager cum Accountant. The petitioners are collected the money and handed over the same to the second accused, who is the main accused, who was granted anticipatory bail. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9184 of 2026

offences are grave in nature. The petitioners are misappropriated huge amount through g-pay and through their accounts. It is a clear case of cheating. The investigation is in initial stage. The petitioners have no previous case against them. A2 is the main accused. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that the petitioners being the employees of the defacto complainant, swindled the amount of Rs.15 lakhs. The investigation is in initial stage. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Heard the counsels on either side and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, already the co-accused was granted anticipatory bail, even according to the prosecution the alleged occurrence took place from 01.07.2023 to 31.08.2024, the FIR has been registered on 24.04.2026, even as per the FIR the main allegation is against the A2 and no previous case is pending against the petitioners and also considering all the



CrI.O.P.(MD)No.9184 of 2026

facts and circumstances of the case, I am inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioners are 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 with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai**, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioners 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 petitioners shall not commit any offences of similar nature.

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

[e] the petitioners 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 petitioners in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioners released on bail by the learned



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9184 of 2026

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)
02.06.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.IV, Madurai.
- 2.The Sub-Inspector of Police,
Koodal Pudhur Police Station,
Madurai City.
(Crime No.191 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9184 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 9184 of 2026

Date : 02.06.2026