

IN THE COURT OF PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENNAI

**Present: Dr.R. Sathya, M.L., Ph.D**

**I Additional Sessions Judge  
(i/c) Principal Sessions Court.**

Friday, the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2026

**Crl.M.P.No. 3166/2026**

**and**

**(Crl.MP.No. 5537/2026)**

**(intervene petition)**

**in**

**G-1, Vepery Police Station, Crime No. not known/2026**

1. Salonee,  
2. Rajendra Kumar Kanooga,  
3. Aruna Kanooga,

.. Petitioners/Accused

Vs.

State Rep. by  
The Inspector of Police,  
G-1, Vepery Police Station,  
Chennai.

..Respondent/Complainant.

This petition is coming on this day before this court for hearing in the presence of M/s.D.Vijay Krishna, Vijay Chordia, G.Karthika, T.Dinesh Kumar, V.Tamilarasan, S.Chandru, the Counsel for the petitioner and M/s.M.Gnanasekar, K.Dillibabu, T.Parthiban, M.N. Kathir, R.Rathi, B.Asha, S. Manigandan, learned counsel for intervenor/defacto complainant and of the CPP for respondent police and upon hearing both sides, this Court delivered the following,

**ORDER**

1. The petitioners, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable u/s. 318(4) and 316(2) of BNS Act in Crime No. not known/2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard both sides.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the said complaint is entirely false, malicious, and are intended to convert a purely civil business dispute into a criminal

proceeding for the sole purpose of extorting money from petitioners family. The petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged, they have been falsely implicated in this case by the police. The petitioners have not fraudulently obtained any money. The business suffered loss due to the de facto complainant's own lack of diligence in managing the distribution and accounting. When the defacto complainant was unwilling to accept the loss, he began demanding return of his entire principal amount along with interest and when his demands were not met, he filed the false complaint with hugely inflated figures. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police. They are not at all involved in any of the offences as alleged. Hence, they may be granted anticipatory bail.

4. On the other hand, the learned CPP submitted that the petitioners had cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.1,01,00,000/-. The transaction between the parties is through bank. Investigation is pending. Hence, the Arrest of the accused is necessary for interrogation.

5. The intervening petitioner states that the petitioners are running a business in the name and style of True Health Company for investing in the business product of Pathanchali, Gebriyalla juice and berry sugar and another 16 products and they induced the defacto complainant to invest in the business for higher returns. Believing their words, the defacto complainant had invested a sum of Rs.1,01,00,000/-, out of which, the amount of Rs.94,00,000/- is transacted with the accused by way of cash, RTGS, IMPS and NEFT. The petitioners fraudulently obtained the said sum from the defacto complainant between 12.07.2024 and 27.12.2024. The defacto complainant and his son also worked as employees in the accused company for monthly salary but they have not given any salary and also failed to repay the investment and committed cheating. Therefore, the learned counsel for the intervener strongly objects to grant bail to the petitioners.

6. The allegation against the petitioners is that they lured the defacto complainant to invest money in their business in the name and style of True Health Company for investing in the business product of Pathanchali, Gebriyalla juice and berry sugar and another 16 products on the false promise of higher returns and cheated to the tune of Rs.1,01,00,000/-. On the other hand, learned counsel for the petitioners submits that it is purely a civil dispute and it has been given a criminal colour only to harass the petitioners. The learned counsel

for the intervenor submitted that based on the complaint of the defacto complainant, the petitioners were called for enquiry by the respondent police, wherein, the petitioners have given undertaking to settle the entire amount, but failed to do so. Hence, had strongly objected to grant bail. In the earlier occasion, the matter has been referred to Mediation Centre for amicable settlement. However, no settlement was arrived and the matter has been returned back to this court. It is also reported by the learned counsel for the defacto complainant that they have moved before the Hon'ble High Court, Madras in W.P.Crl.No.892/2026 for direction to the respondent police to conduct enquiry, wherein, the Hon'ble High Court, Madras by its order dated 18.06.2026 directed the police to complete the enquiry within a period of 4 weeks. In these circumstances, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Petition is dismissed.

Dictated to Steno-typist, typed by him directly, corrected and pronounced by me in open court this the 3<sup>rd</sup> day of July, 2026.

*J. H. C. A. 3/7/26*  
**I Additional Sessions Judge**  
**(i/c.) Principal Sessions Judge**