

TNMD010016712026



In the Court of the Principal Sessions Judge, Madurai.

Present : **Thiru. S. SHUNMUGAVEL B.A., B.L.,**
(II Additional District Judge (CBI Cases) , Madurai)
Principal Sessions Judge (i/c), Madurai.
(Authorised U/s.8(8) of BNSS)

Monday, this the 16th day of March, 2026.

CrI.M.P.No.1170/2026

CNR No.TNMD010016712026

1. Sahul Hameed, S/o.Sarbudeen
2. Sorambeevi, W/o.Sahul Hameed ... Petitioners/Accused.

Vs

State through the Inspector of Police,
Kottampatti P.S. in Cr.No.219/2025 ... Respondent/Complainant.

This e-petition coming on today for hearing before me in the presence of Thiru.R.Balamurugan, Advocate for the petitioners and of Public Prosecutor for the state, this court passed the following:

Order

1. Anticipatory Bail application u/s 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023 (BNSS).

2. Heard both.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners/A2 and A3 would submit that the respondent police has registered a case against the petitioners and another in Cr.No.219/2025 for the offences u/s. 296(b), 316 and 318(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023. The alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 27.08.2025. The petitioners are parents of A1. This is 2nd petition of the 1st petitioner/A2. The petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged. The defacto-complainant himself admitted in FIR that he went to abroad in tourist visa. All the transactions held between the A1 and the defacto-complainant. The petitioners are in no way connected with this case. There is no proof filed on the side of prosecution for payment of Rs.6,30,000/-. The date of payment is not mentioned in F.I.R. Custodial interrogation of the petitioners is not

necessary in this case. Already co-accused/A1 was released on bail by the concerned Judicial Magistrate. Investigation is almost over. The petitioners have not filed similar petition before the Hon'ble Madurai Bench of Madras High Court or any other court. The petitioners apprehend arrest at the hands of police and they are ready to abide by any conditions that would be imposed by this court and prayed to allow the petition.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor submitted that totally there are 3 accused persons in this case and the petitioners are A2 and A3. As per the case of the prosecution, the defacto-complainant and A1 are friends. A2 and A3 are parents of A1. A1 is working in Cambodia. All the accused persons approached the defacto-complainant and demanded amount to arrange job in Cambodia for defacto-complainant. A1 promised that he will arrange computer operator job. Believing the words of accused, the defacto-complainant has given Rs.6,30,000/- on various dates to A2 and A3. A1 obtained only tourist visa and arranged job for the defacto-complainant in a scam company. Hence, the defacto-complainant returned back to India. All the accused persons cheated the defacto-complainant a sum of Rs.6,30,000/-. Hence, the case. Cheated amount is not yet recovered. Investigation is pending and strongly objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Rival contentions are taken into consideration. The alleged offences against the petitioner are U/s. 296(b), 316 and 318(4) of Bharatiya Nyaya Sanhita (BNS), 2023. The alleged occurrence is said to have taken place on 27.08.2025. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the defacto-complainant himself admitted in FIR that he went to abroad in tourist visa, there is no proof filed on the side of prosecution for payment of Rs.6,30,000/- and the date of payment is not mentioned in F.I.R. On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor raised strong objections stating that all the accused persons cheated the defacto-complainant a sum of Rs.6,30,000/- under the guise of getting job in abroad. It is a case of job racketing. It is stated that cheated amount is not yet recovered. As per

prosecution, custodial interrogation of the petitioners is very essential in this case. Investigation is pending. Considering all these aspects, the nature of offences, pending stage of investigation, strong objections raised on the side of prosecution and the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage, accordingly the petition is liable to be dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on the 16th day of March, 2026.

Principal Sessions Judge (i/c),
Madurai

Copy to : The J.M.Melur.