BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Date : 08.06.2026

PRESENT

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE P. DHANABAL

CRL OP(MD). No. 10335 of 2026

1. Kavitha
2. Praveen Kumar
3. Parameswari ...Petitioners/Accused

Vs

State of Tamil Nadu rep. by
1. The Inspector of Police,
Karuppayurani Police Station,
Madurai District
(Crime No.81 of 2026)

2. Rose Kamalan ...Respondents

For Petitioners : Mr.K.Ragadeeshkumar
for M/s.Issac Chambers
For Intervenor : Mr.G.Rajagopalan
For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian
Counsel for State of Tamil Nadu (Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec.482 of BNSS

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory Bail in Cr.No.81 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioners/A1 to A3, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent for the offences punishable under Sections 316, 318, 336(3), 338, 296(b), 115(2) and 351(2) of BNS in Crime No.81 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the brother of the defacto complaint namely Ashok Kumar was residing in Singapore and employed as an Engineer and Project Manager. While so, when he returned to India in the year 2019 , died during his life time he invested money about Rs. 2 Crores. While so, A1 to A3 approached the family of the defacto complainant for marriage proposal with the first accused, thereafter marriage was solemnized on 14.02.2022 at Madurai. The first accused after knowing the legalheirs of the deceased Ashok Kumar inorder to grab money mislead the legalheirs and driven away one Johnson Rajkumar, thereafter the first accused was residing together at Coimbatore. When the defacto complainant informed the first accused that sister Susila Rani and her brother Rajaraja Cholan has also received Provident Fund and savings of the deceased Ashok Kumar. The first accused assured that she would facilitate the process of obtaining the said amounts. Believing the said

words, the defacto complainant acted inaccordance with law with her instructions. Thereafter separate bank accounts were opened by the legal heirs in the Canara Bank and the same were managed and manipulated by the first accused. The first accused obtained signature of the defacto complainant and others in the blank cheques on the pretext that the same were required for payment of insurance. Thereafter the provident fund amount of the deceased Ashok Kumar have been credited in the account of the legal heirs to the tune of Rs. 22,63,498.06 and the said amount was utilized by A1 to A3. The first accused obtained NOC from the defacto complainant and her sister. Thereafter an order was passed by the Family Justice Courts of the Republic of Singapore in FC.P4656/2022 dated 10.01.2023. Thereafter the first accused forged the signature of the Rajaraja cholan and forwarded the same to I fast Share Market Company through E.mail. Based on the said declaration a sum of Rs.1.50 crores was transferred to the account of Rajarajacholan. Thereafter the first accused subsequently transferred the said amount to the bank account of her husband Johnson Rajkumar by making use of the blank signed cheques, thereby misappropriated funds. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and a false case has been foisted against them. The petitioners have nothing to do with the alleged crime. He would further submit that the actual dispute between the defacto complainant and the petitioners are matrimonial dispute and purely civil in nature. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor would submit that the first accused misappropriated funds of Rs.1.5 crores by misusing his official capacity. The defacto complainant and two others are the legal heirs of the deceased /Ashok Kumar. The said Ashok Kumar was employed at Singapore and inorder to grab the death benefits of the Ashok Kumar accounts were opened in Canara Bank where the first accused worked as Manager. At that time the first accused had obtained blank signed cheque with the defacto complainant and others and thereafter the provident fund amount was credited to the legal heirs of the deceased thereafter a sum of Rs.1.5 Crores was transferred to the account of Rajarajacholan. For administration purpose they appointed the husband of the first accused as administrator. The deceased/Ashok Kumar and the first accused obtained

No Objection Certificate from the defacto complainant and her sister and thereafter amount of Rs.1.5 Crores was transferred to the account of Rajarajacholan . The said amount was transferred to the account of the first accused and the said amount was misappropriated by the first accused and the investigation is at the initial stage, thereby he vehemently objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the amount involved in this case is very huge and the investigation is at the initial stage, hence he strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

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

7. Considering the rival submissions on either side, considering the nature of offences and also considering the fact there is a dispute between the parties in respect of apportionment of retirement benefits of deceased Ashokkumar and already the first petitioner lodged complaint as against the defacto complainant and others and the same is pending and even according to the prosecution the entire case is borne out of records and the alleged

occurrence took place on 26.09.2024 but the First Information has been registered on 26.05.2026 and also considering all other factors, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, 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.II,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 conditions that:

[b] the petitioners shall report before the respondent police on every Saturday at 10.30 a.m., until further orders

[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 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)
08.06.2026

aav

To

1.The Judicial Magistrate No.II,Madurai

2.The Inspector of Police,
Karuppayurani Police Station,
Madurai District

3.The Additional Public Prosecutor,
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

CRL OP(MD). No. 10335 of 2026

P. DHANABAL, J

aav

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No. 10335 of 2026

Date : 08.06.2026