

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE, TIRUCHIRAPPALLI

**Present: Thiru. M. Christopher, B.A., B.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruchirappalli**

Saturday, the 6th day of June 2026
Crl. M.P. Nos. 1918 / 2026 and 2025/2026

1. Krishnamoorthy(A3), aged 53/26, S/o. Angamuthu
 2. Subha @ Subhalakshmi(A4), aged 44/26, W/o. Krishnamoorthy
- ...Petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 1918/2026

Vs.

Inspector of Police,
DCB P.S., Trichy Cr.No. 9/2026

...Respondent

Indumathi, aged 31/26, W/o. Iruthayaraj ...Petitioner/intervener in Crl.M.P. No. 2025/2026

This petition coming before me for hearing, on this day, in the presence of Thiru. P. Savarimuthu, Public Prosecutor for the State and of advocate Thiru. R. Saravanakumar, for the petitioners in Crl.M.P. No. 1918/2026 and of advocate Thiru. T. Senthilkumar, for the petitioner in Crl.M.P. No. 2025/2026 after hearing both sides and considering these necessary materials, this court today passed the following:-

COMMON ORDER

It is an application for anticipatory bail filed u/s.482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023.

FIR was registered against the petitioners and other accused for the offences u/s.316, 318(4) and 351(2) of BNS. The occurrence happened between the period from 01.12.2024 to 20.05.2025.

According to the learned counsel for the petitioners, the petitioners are innocent and they have been falsely implicated in this case and the earlier bail application was dismissed by the vacation court and hence, prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

On the other hand, the learned Public Prosecutor contended that the petitioners and other accused were involved in the occurrence and no previous case is pending against the

accused and the investigation is pending and hence, objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

The defacto complainant filed an intervening petition through his counsel and submitted that on various occasions, he transferred the amount to the account of the accused's son and also, to whom they told to send and they cheated the amount and not to arrange a job to him and when they asked either job or returning of money, they scolded and avoided him and if the bail is to be granted, they would abscond and could not collect the amount and objected to grant anticipatory bail to them.

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of records, it would show that on believing the words of the 1st accused, the defacto complainant gave a sum of Rs.25,17,800/- through RTGS for obtaining job at London for his son and the said amount was credited in to the account of the 2nd accused and they neither arranged job nor returned the money to the defacto complainant. The occurrence happened between the period from 01.12.2024 to 20.05.2025. Considering the overt act against the petitioners and the petitioners are the parents of the main accused and also, considering the fact that they have been participating in the transaction and they were evidence of foreign job to the defacto complainant and cheated more than Rs.25 Lakh and considering the submissions made by the prosecution, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners at this stage. Hence, the application for anticipatory bail in respect of the petitioners is dismissed.

The Intervening Petition in Crl.M.P.No. 2025 /2026 is allowed.

Pronounced by me, in the open court, on this the 6th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruchirappalli.

Copy to:

1. The Petitioner through petitioner's counsel.
2. The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tiruchirappalli.
3. The Inspector of Police, DCB P.S., Tiruchirappalli.