

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL SESSIONS JUDGE, PUDUKKOTTAI****PRESENT : Thiru.K.Poorana Jeya Anand, M.A., M.L.,****Principal Sessions Judge, Pudukkottai.****Thursday the 26<sup>th</sup> day of March, 2026**

Criminal Miscellaneous Petition No:688/2026

{CNR No.TNPD01-0012432026}

\*\*\*\*\*

Arumugam, S/o. Karuppaiah.

.....Petitioner/ Accused

/Versus/

State of Tamil Nadu represented by Inspector of Police,

Aranthangi Police Station,

Cr.No.446/2025.

...Respondent/Complainant

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.P.Balamurugan, Learned Advocate appearing for the Petitioner and the Learned Public Prosecutor Thiru.B.Venkatesan, on behalf of the Complainant and this Court passed the following,

**ORDER**

This petition is filed by the petitioner u/s 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS) - 2023, praying for anticipatory bail.

Notice was issued. Reply was filed by the prosecution.

The Learned Counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is being charged for the offences U/s. 465, 468, 471, 420 of IPC in Cr.No.446/2025 of Aranthangi Police Station and he has not committed any offences as alleged and he has been falsely implicated in this case. Further he submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by any condition imposed by this court and hence, he seeks anticipator bail for the petitioner.

On the side of the Prosecution, the Learned Public Prosecutor submits that the accused persons and including this petitioner had created fake policy and issued General Central Insurance Policy to the owner of the vehicle and get premium amount for the said policy and the investigation is in a preliminary stage and hence, he strongly opposed to release the petitioner on anticipatory bail.

**With regard to anticipatory bail**, this court relied upon a case law reported in AIR 1980 SC. 1632 rendering by our Hon'ble Supreme Court of India in a case of Shri Gurbaksh Singh Sibbia Vs.State of Punjab, wherein it

has been held as follows:-

**“The nature and seriousness of the proposed charges, the context of the events likely to lead to the making of the charges, a reasonable possibility of the applicant's presence not being secured at the trial, a reasonable apprehension that witnesses will be tampered with and "the larger interests of the public or the state" are some of the considerations which the court has to keep in mind while deciding an application for anticipatory bail.”**

Heard. Reply received. The petitioner is the owner of the vehicle . The Investigation Officer is also present. As per the version of the Investigation Officer, he is going to enquire the present petitioner with regard to payment of premium to the person concern. Now the investigation is in preliminary stage. The involvement of the petitioner is not at all determined by the prosecution agency. Hence it is premature stage to decide that whether the present petitioner is involved in the crime or not. The investigation agency is alone competent to decide the issue. If necessary the Investigation Officer can issue notice u/s. 41(a) of Cr.P.C. to the petitioner and enquire him. Hence the petition is dismissed. Order passed accordingly.

In the result, this Anticipatory Bail Petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in Open Court, this the 26th day of March' 2026.

**Principal Sessions Judge,  
Pudukkottai.**

**Copy to**

The Counsel for the petitioner.