



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10018 of 2026

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 03.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 10018 of 2026

1.Balasubramanian
2.Senthilkumar

... Petitioners

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
CCB - Madurai City,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.20 of 2026)

...Respondents/Complainant

For Petitioners : Mr.R.Ramanujam
Advocate.

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

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No. 20 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 318(4), 351(3) of BNS, in Crime No.20



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10018 of 2026

of 2026, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 and the defacto complainant were friends for the past 20 years. The first accused introduced the A2 to A5 to the defacto complainant. They became friends. A1, A3 to A5 invited the defacto complainant to invest the money with A2's business. Further they started LPG Petrol Bulk at Kosakulam Madurai. Believing their words the defacto complainant invested huge amount in the business. Initially they given 2 % profit to the defacto complainant for a very short period. Thereafter, they failed to do so. When the same was asked they stated that there is huge outstanding amount to the dealer the supply was stopped and promised to give profit once supply received. But, they did not do so. Thereafter they seeks 6 months time. But, even after 6 months they did not give any money to the defacto complainant. When the defacto complainant asked about the same with the A2, he abused him in filthy language and also threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the case.

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



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10018 of 2026

alleged by the prosecution. The petitioners had not ever seen the defacto complainant. They have no connection with the defacto complainant either directly or indirectly. A1 was earlier worked as incharge in the 1st petitioner's Auto LPG Gas pump at Chennai, where involved in misappropriation of funds, therefore, he terminated the A1. After the registration of the FIR only the petitioners came to know that A1 by misusing the 1st petitioner's goodwill and cheques involved in the above offence. Hence, he prays to grant Anticipatory Bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) submits that the offences are grave in nature. The petitioners are misappropriated huge amount of the defacto complainant by conspiring together. The petitioners have no previous case. He vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the records.

6. Considering the rival submissions on either side and the nature of offences charged against the petitioners, there is a dispute between the parties in respect of Petroleum dealership, even according to the prosecution the



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10018 of 2026

alleged transactions took place from the year 2023, for which the FIR has been registered on 10.03.2026, there is a delay in lodging the complaint and registering the FIR, there is no previous case against the petitioner, and also considering all the 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 bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen days from the date on which the order copy made ready, before the learned **Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai**, on condition that the petitioners shall 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 Magistrate concerned and on further condition 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.



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10018 of 2026

[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
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)
03.06.2026

TM

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
CCB - Madurai City,
Madurai District.
(Crime No.20 of 2026)
- 3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.(MD)No.10018 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J.

TM

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No. 10018 of 2026

Date : 03.06.2026