

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
COIMBATORE.**

**Present: Tmt. G. VIJAYA, B.A., M.L., PGDCFS,  
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, COIMBATORE**

**Monday, this the 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026**

**CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION Nos.768/2026 and 744/2026**

Senthilvasan (Age 51 years)

S/o. Kandasamy.

... Petitioner in C.M.P.No.768/2026 / A-1

Anbushelvan ( Age 46 years)

S/o. Thiyagarajan.

... Petitioner in C.M.P.No.744/2026 / A-3

/vs/

State, Rep. by

through the Inspector of Police,

**E2 Peelamedu Police Station,**

**Crime No.740/2025.**

**Offences:u/s.318(4) of BNS.**

Through the Public Prosecutor, Coimbatore.

(The Judicial Magistrate No.2, Coimbatore.)

... Respondent

These two petitions have been filed on behalf of the petitioner in the respective petitions, to release them on bail u/s.483 of BNSS [C.M.P.No.768/2026] as well as anticipatory bail u/s.482 of BNSS.

These two petitions are coming on this day for final hearing before this Court in the presence of **Tvl. S. Aji kumar, R.R. Priyadharshini and R.Karthikeyan,** Advocates for the Petitioner in C.M.P.No.768/2026 / A-1 and of **Tvl. R. Rajesh, M. Maharaja and S. Nihar Ali,** Advocates for the Petitioner in C.M.P.No.744/2026 / A-3 and of **Thiru. Balajee Sridhar,** Advocate for the defacto complainant / Intervener [C.M.P.No.820/2026 and C.M.P.No.880/2026] and **Thiru. V.Ravichandran, Public Prosecutor,** represented for State, upon perusing the petitions submitted and upon hearing both side arguments, this Court pronounced the following:-

**COMMON ORDER**

**Heard both side.**

The petitioner is the accused in Crime No.740/2025 of E2 Peelamedu Police Station, for the alleged offence u/s.318(4) of BNS, he has filed the petition, seeking grant of bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner in C.M.P.No.768/2026 submitted that this petitioner is arrayed as A-1. This petitioner received a sum of Rs.70,000/- from the defacto complainant. Except the above said amount, no amount has been received by the petitioner. This petitioner has no intention to cheat the defacto complainant. This petitioner has no knowledge about the dealings between the defacto complainant and other accused. This petitioner only introduced the other accused to the defacto complainant. The petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case and he never indulged in any such activities as alleged and he is ready to abide any condition and he is in judicial custody for the past 36 days and prays to enlarge the petitioner on bail. The learned counsel has further submitted that this petitioner is ready to settle a sum of Rs.10.0 lakhs to the defacto complainant by way of Demand Draft.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner in C.M.P.No.744/2026 submitted that this petitioner is arrayed as A-3. This petitioner is the friend of A-4. After registration of the FIR, Rs.50.0 lakhs has been recovered from A-5. No amount has been recovered from this petitioner. The petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely roped in this case and he never indulged in any such activities as alleged and he is apprehending arrest in the hands of the respondent police and he is ready to abide any condition and prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The learned counsel has further submitted that without prejudice to the petitioner, the petitioner is ready to settle a sum of Rs.10.0 lakhs to the defacto complainant by way of Demand Draft.

4. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant submitted that the defacto complainant is running a company under the name and style of Ultra Readymix Concrete Private Limited. The said company undertakes construction work not only for private clients but also for Government sector contracts. For developing the business, the defacto complainant is in need of financial assistance and the defacto complainant came to know A-1 through his friend Hari. A-1 has projected himself as a commissioner broker and he is having the capacity of arranging funds from private lenders and he would charge a commission for arranging the same. A-1 assured that he will arrange Rs.25 crores and demanded 2% as commission. Believing his words, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.70,000/- towards inspection charges. Thereafter, A-1 introduced A-2 to A-4 stating that they are running a firm under the name and style of Global Investments and they are ready to give financial assistance to the defacto complainant and A-1 arranged meeting on 18-07-2025 at Salem. At that time, A-2 to A-4 assured that they will provide financial assistance of Rs.25 cores and for which, they demanded the defacto complainant to execute a promissory note, a security document and also insisted that the same has to be registered. Further they have produced two Demand Draft for a sum of Rs.12.5 crores each allegedly issued by A-1 to A-4 and thereafter, they demanded a sum of Rs.67 lakhs as advance and asked the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.50,00,000/- to a bank account in the name of THE SRO TAMILNADU and a sum of Rs.17,00,000/- to the account of Global Investments and thereafter, the above said two demand draft would be

handed over to the defacto complainant. Believing their words, the defacto complainant transferred a total sum of Rs.67,00,000/- as mentioned above. Further the accused represented that they had booked registration slots for the security document through registration department and produced two token receipts one is dated 07-08-2025 for a slot at Pollachi Sub-Registrar Office and another dated 12-08-2025 for a slot at Gandhipuram Sub Registrar Office. Thereafter, the accused started to avoid the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant got suspicion and on verification, the defacto complainant came to know that the account stands in the name of “The SRO Tamil Nadu” was not a government account as represented by the accused and the said account belongs to A-5. The amount of Rs.50,00,000/- and a sum of Rs.17,00,000/- which were transferred by the defacto complainant has been subjected to multiple subsequent transactions carried out by A-1 to A-5 to siphon off the money. Further the alleged demand drafts shown by A-1 to A-4 are fake and no such demand draft has been issued by the bank authority. Thereafter, the defacto complainant lodged complaint against the accused and based on the same, the respondent police registered the FIR. After registration of the FIR, the accused persons transferred a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- to the defacto complainant’s account and remaining amount is yet to be recovered. Further two other accused are still absconding. The learned counsel has further submitted that as the petitioner in the respective petitions are ready to settle a sum of Rs.10.0 lakhs each to the defacto complainant by way of demand draft, the defacto complainant has no objection to grant bail as well as anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the respective petitions. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant has filed two separate memos in this regard.

5. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that there are five and others. **The petitioner in C.M.P.No.768/2026 is arrayed as A-1. The petitioner in C.M.P.No.744/2206 is arrayed as A-3.** A-3 and A-5 are still absconding. All the accused are known persons. A-1 is acted as mediator in arranging loan on commission basis. A-2 to A-5 opened a bank account in the name of Global Investments for the purpose of cheating victims by way of arranging loan. The defacto complainant is running a construction company under the name and style of “Ultra Readymix Concrete Private Limited” for the past 30 years. The defacto complainant in order to develop his business, approached one Hari for arranging loan in private finance. On 02-05-2025, the said Hari introduced A-1 to the defacto complainant as Mediator and stating that he will arrange loan on commission basis. The defacto complainant asked a sum of Rs.25 crores as loan and for which, A-1 demanded 2% commission and to bare the expenses of the investors to visit the company for inspecting the company. On 03-05-2025, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.70,000/- as inspection cost to the account of A-1. Thereafter, the accused delayed in loan process and when the defacto complainant questioned A-1, he introduced A-2 to A-4 as they are running Global Investments at Chennai and arranged a meeting at Salem. On 18-07-2025, on behalf of the defacto complainant, his company CEO attended the said meeting and at that time, A-2 to A-4 agreed to give a sum of Rs.25 crores to the defacto complainant’s company and demanded the

defacto complainant to execute a promissory note and security agreement. Further A-2 to A-4 demanded a sum of Rs.67,00,000/- as advance to secure the loan amount of Rs.25 crores and in addition to that they had shown fake demand drafts two in numbers for a sum of Rs.12.50 crores each. Believing their words, on 08-08-2025, the defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.50,00,000/- to the bank namely TNSRO which belongs to A-5 and transferred a sum of Rs.17,00,000/- to the account of Global Investment company. Thereafter, the accused started to avoid the defacto complainant. Therefore the defacto complainant enquired the accused about the loan amount and requested to return the amount received and all the accused refused to return the amount and cheated the defacto complainant.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor has further submitted that on investigation, it reveals that all the accused are habitual offenders in committing the similar offence and created different bank accounts including bank account stands in the name of TNSRO as Government account and cheated the innocent people and the accused shared the cheated amount among themselves. After registration of the case, the accused had transferred a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- to the defacto complainant's account and remaining amount is yet to be recovered. Except the present case, the petitioner in the respective petitions are involved in another case. Investigation is still pending.

7. This Court has considered the submissions made by both side. The petitioner in the respective petitions are arrayed as accused in Crime No.740/2025 of Peelamedu Police Station, for the offence u/s.318(4) of BNS. As per the prosecution case, the petitioner in the respective petitions along with other accused received amount from the defacto complainant under the guise of arranging loan of Rs.25 crores for developing the defacto complainant's business and subsequently cheated the defacto complainant. It is the contention of the petitioner in the respective petitions that, the petitioner in the respective petitions have been falsely roped in this case and they have not committed any offence as alleged. Further they are ready to settle a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- each to the defacto complainant by way of demand draft without prejudice to them. Though the learned counsel for the defacto complainant vehemently opposed to grant bail as well as anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the respective petitions, since the petitioner in the respective petitions are ready to settle a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- each to the defacto complainant by way of demand draft and he has also produced a memo in this regard along with copy of demand draft. The learned Public Prosecutor contended that the accused persons conspired together with an intention to cheat the defacto complainant under the pretext of arranging loan and subsequently they cheated the defacto complainant. After registration of the case, the accused had transferred a sum of Rs.15,00,000/- to the defacto complainant's account and remaining amount is yet to be recovered. Taking into consideration of all the above, **this Court is inclined to grant bail as well as anticipatory bail to the petitioner in the respective petitions:-**

**C.M.P.No.768/2026:- (Bail Petition)**

- (i) The petitioner is ordered to be enlarged on bail on his executing a bond for Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum each to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.2, Coimbatore.
- (ii) 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.
- (iii) The petitioner is directed to sign before the respondent police, daily at 10.00 a.m. for a period of 15 days.**
- (iv) The petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.
- (v) The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.
- (vi) 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 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]**.
- (vii) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

**C.M.P.No.744/2026:- (Anticipatory Bail Petition)**

- (i) Anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner.**
- (ii) The petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs.10,000/- in the event of his arrest or the petitioner shall surrender before the Judicial Magistrate No.2, Coimbatore, and execute a bond of Rs.10,000/- within 15 days from the date of this order, failing which the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall stand automatically cancelled.
- (iii) The petitioner shall produce two sureties for likesum each to the value of Rs.10,000/- to the satisfaction of the Judicial Magistrate No.2, Coimbatore, within 15 days from the date of this order, failing which the anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner shall stand automatically cancelled.
- (iv) 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.

(v) **The petitioner is directed to sign before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m., for a period of for a period of 15 days.**

(vi) The petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial.

(vii) The petitioner shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial.

(viii) 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 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]**.

(ix) If the accused thereafter abscond, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of BNS.

This order is dictated to steno-typist, typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me on this 16<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026.

PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,  
COIMBATORE.

**CC to :**

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court No.2, Coimbatore.
2. The Superintendent, Central Prison, Coimbatore.
3. The Public Prosecutor, Coimbatore.
4. The Inspector of Police, Peelamedu Police Station,
5. Counsel for the Petitioner in the respective petitions / Accused.
6. Counsel for the defacto complainant / Intervener.