

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

**Present: Thiru.A.K.Babulal, B.Com., LL.M.,
I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, COIMBATORE.(FAC)**

Friday, this the 06th day of March, 2026

CRIMINAL MISCELLANEOUS PETITION No.756/2026

Raja @ Muniyaraja (Age 30 years)
S/o. Ayyanar.

... Petitioner /Accused.

/vs/

State, Rep. by
through the Inspector of Police,
**C2 Race Course Police Station,
Crime No.80/2026.**

Offences:u/s. 316(1) and 316(4) of BNS.

Through the Public Prosecutor, Coimbatore.
(The Judicial Magistrate Court No.3, Coimbatore.)

... Respondent

This petition has been filed through **e-Filing** on behalf of the petitioner to release him on anticipatory bail u/s.482 of BNS.

This petition is coming on this day for final hearing before this Court in the presence of **Thiru. S. Rajendran**, Advocate for the Petitioner/ Accused and **Thiru. S.Sivakumar**, Advocate for the defacto complainant / Intervener [CMP.No.832/2026] and **Thiru. V. Ravichandran, Public Prosecutor**, represented for State, upon perusing the petition submitted and upon hearing both side arguments, this Court pronounced the following:-

ORDER

Heard both sides.

The petitioner is the accused in Crime No.80/2026 of C2 Race Course Police Station, since he is apprehending arrest in the hands of the respondent police for the alleged u/s.316(1) and 316(4) of BNS, he has filed this petition, seeking grant of Anticipatory bail.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner has submitted that the petitioner previously worked as a collecting agent in previously engaged Trust, managed by one

Lakshmi, and now the petitioner runs a separate business. The petitioner handed over all the details, all papers, all the accounts with statement with bank details to the defacto complainant. When the police called the petitioner for enquiry, the petitioner produced the documents before the respondent police and that CSR was closed. Since the defacto complainant is highly influenced person, this new false complaint has been given and based on the same, the petitioner has been added as an accused. The petitioner is ready to abide any conditions imposed by this Court and prays for grant of anticipatory bail to him.

3. The learned counsel for the defacto complainant has submitted that the defacto complainant is running a Trust and the Trust is a social welfare organization and the object of the Trust is women's empowerment, forming self-help groups and arranging loan for the self-help groups and collection of bank loan installments from self-help groups. The petitioner herein had been appointed as collection agent and his responsibility is collecting monthly loan installments from self-help groups and depositing them into the respective banks. The women belonging to self-groupss were paying the monthly installment amount as usual to the petitioner, who worked in the complainant Trust. Despite paying their monthly installments to the petitioner, the banks declared these groups as "Defaulters" by the end of 2025. Thereafter, it came to know that the petitioner mishandled the collected funds and committed the offence of breach of trust. Further it came to know that the petitioner collected monthly installments from SHG members and fabricated bank counter slips to pretend the money was deposited. Upon verification with the banks, it was discovered that no funds were credited to the accounts, and the collected amounts were misappropriated. Under these circumstances, if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he will abscond and tamper the witnesses and strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has submitted that the defacto complainant is the Managing Trustee of the Sri Lakshmi Ammal Trust. The defacto complainant Trust is a registered Trust and it has been tie-up with many banks to get loan to self-help groups for women. The accused is the staff of the defacto complainant Trust. His duty is collecting monthly loan installments from 65 self-help groups and depositing them into the respective banks. The accused had collected monthly installments of Rs.13 lakh, but he did not remit the same to the banks and further he had created forged bank receipts and cheated the defacto complainant Trust and the

self-help groups people. In this case, the amount is not yet recovered. Investigation is not yet completed and opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard. As per the prosecution case, the accused misappropriated monthly installment funds collected from SHG members meant for loan repayment to banks and he fabricated bank counter slips to create the illusion that the money was being deposited into the SHG accounts and despite regular payments by SHG members to the petitioner, the banks declared the groups as "Defaulters" and verification with the banks revealed no funds were credited to the accounts, and the money was misappropriated by the accused. It is the main contention of the petitioner that, as per the normal course of practice and transaction, the petitioner collected money from the self-help groups and paid the same to the concerned bank from August 2024 to September 2025 and he handed over all the details, all papers, all the account with statement with bank details to the defacto complainant and after relieving job from the said Trust, the petitioner started the same business as individual from November 2025 and therefore due to vengeance, the defacto complainant lodged this false complaint with false allegations, and the petitioner has not created any documents as alleged by the defacto complainant and all transactions have been executed by the petitioner as per the direction of the defacto complainant and the defacto complainant gave a complaint in December 2025, and based on the same, the petitioner moved for anticipatory bail in CMP No.200/2026 and the same has been disposed of stating that the respondent police closed the CSR on 28-01-2026 and now the defacto complainant preferred another false complaint and registered the FIR under influence and the petitioner is an innocent and prays for grant of anticipatory bail to him. Per contra, the learned counsel for the defacto complainant contended that, the defacto complainant Trust lodged a complaint before the respondent police and during enquiry by the police, the petitioner admitted his offence and thereafter, on 12-01-2026, the petitioner moved anticipatory bail and the said application was dismissed stating that CSR was closed and thereafter, the defacto complainant Trust filed a petition seeking direction for registration of the FIR against the petitioner before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.3, Coimbatore and as per the direction, the respondent police registered the FIR and if the petitioner is granted anticipatory bail, he will abscond and tamper the witnesses and strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. The learned Public Prosecutor reported that investigation is not yet completed. After considering all the above said aspects, considering the nature of offence, nature of allegation, and stage of the investigation, **this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage.**

Hence this petition is dismissed.

This order is dictated to steno-typist, typed by her, corrected and pronounced by me on this 06th day of March, 2026.

I ADDITIONAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE,
PRINCIPAL DISTRICT & SESSIONS JUDGE, (FAC)
COIMBATORE.

CC to :

1. The Judicial Magistrate Court No.3, Coimbatore.
2. The Public Prosecutor, Coimbatore.
3. The Inspector of Police, C2 Race Course Police Station,
4. Counsel for the Petitioner/ Accused.
5. Counsel for the defacto complainant / Intervener.