

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT AT SRIVILLIPUTTUR.**

Present: **Thiru.A.Kanthakumar, M.L.,**
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at Srivilliputtur.

Dated this the 08th day of June 2026, Monday.

Cr.M.P. No.1623/2026

1. John Thangaraj
2. Jeba Felina

... Petitioners/Accused.

/ Vs /

State through the Inspector of Police,
DCB, Virudhunagar
Unknown Cr.No. /2026
U/s.316(2) and 318(4) of BNS.

... Respondent/ Complainant.

This petition coming on this day before me for hearing in the presence of Thiru.S.Bilal, Advocate for the petitioners and Thiru.S.Thirumalaiappan, Public Prosecutor for the respondent and upon hearing the argument of both sides, this court made the following

ORDER

It is an application for anticipatory bail u/s.482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita (BNSS)

FIR was registered against the petitioners/A5 and A6 for the offence u/s.316(2) and 318(4) of BNS. The occurrence happened on 23-07-2025.

The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant entered into a sale agreement dated 23-07-2025 in respect of a vacant land measuring an extent of 17 acres and 86 cents situated at Moolipatti village, Virudhunagar District for a total sale consideration of Rs.1,25,02,000/-. Prior to the sale agreement, defacto complainant transferred a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- on 21-07-2025 and 22-07-2025 and further Rs.45,00,000/- was paid as advance and further payments were Rs.13,00,000/-, 5,00,000/-, 10,00,000/- and

Rs.21,00,000/- and paid total sum of Rs.99,00,000/-. But accused did not execute the sale deed after receiving the balance consideration. Hence, this case.

The learned counsel for the petitioners contended that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and hence anticipatory bail may be granted to the petitioners on any condition. On the other hand, the learned P.P raised objection to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that if the petitioners are granted anticipatory bail they would commit similar types of offences again and hence he objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

Heard both sides. Records perused. On perusal of the records would show that it is a case of criminal breach of trust and cheating. The learned P.P.strongly opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners on the ground that no FIR is pending against the petitioners and the offence related with the property and the dispute between the parties is in enquiry stage and the petitioners not co-operated for enquiry. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the anticipatory bail may be granted to petitioners on any condition. Considering that the petitioners seek anticipatory bail for the alleged offence u/s.316(2) and 318(4) of BNS, but the prosecution submitted that no FIR is registered against the petitioners. Hence, this petition deserves to be dismissed.

In the result, the petition is dismissed.

Pronounced by me in the Open Court on this the 08th day of June 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Virudhunagar District at
Srivilliputtur.

To

The Inspector of Police, DCB, Virudhunagar