

Dhilip Kumar Vs The State of Tamilnadu

Dhilip Kumar Vs The State of Tamilnadu

SooperKanoon Citation : sooperkanoon.com/1663231

Court : Chennai

Decided On : Jul-02-2026

Judge : Honourable Mr.Justice K.Rajasekar

Appeal No. : CRL OP(MD)/13116/2026

Appellant : Dhilip Kumar

Respondent : The State of Tamilnadu

Judgement :

BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction) Date : 02.07.2026 PRESENT THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR CRL OP(MD). No. 13116 of 2026 Dhilip Kumar ...Petitioner Vs State of Tamil Nadu rep. by The Inspector of Police, Teppakulam Police Station, Madurai City. (Crime No.208 of 2026) ...Respondent/Complainant For Petitioner : Mr.R.L.Dhilipan Pandian Advocate For Respondent : Mr.N.Balasubramanian Counsel for State of TN (Crl. Side) For Intervenor : Ms.P.Krishnaveni PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec.483 of BNSS PRAYER :- For Bail in Cr.No. 208 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police.

ORDER : The Court made the following order :-

The petitioner / Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 11.06.2026, for the offences punishable under Section 318(4) of IPC, in Crime No.208 of 2026 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner herein is the friend of the defacto complainant and canvassed the defacto complainant and received the 12 sovereigns of gold jewels for the purpose of arranging money for the studies of petitioner's children. However, it was not returned back. Hence, the complaint.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the

petitioner is innocent and he was falsely implicated in this case and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He would further submit that due to financial constraints, he was unable to return back the gold jewels. It is not a case of cheating. The petitioner is in custody from 11.06.2026 and ready to abide any condition imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed bail for the petitioner.

4. The learned Counsel appearing for the State reiterated the prosecution

case and reported that the petitioner has no previous case. During the enquiry, 2 sovereigns of gold jewels were recovered and at the time of arrest 4 grams of gold jewel was recovered. Investigation is still pending. He opposed the grant of bail to the petitioner. 5. The learned counsel for the intervenor submitted that since the petitioner collected huge value of gold and the same has not been returned back, the case has been registered and the petitioner was arrested. If he is released on bail, there is no possibility of getting back of the remaining jewels.

6. This Court heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

7. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and nature of

offences, it is not a case of misappropriation of gold jewels, it is only obtained for the purpose of studies of the children and thereafter, he is

not able to return back, the petitioner has no previous case and also considering the period of incarceration and I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner subject to certain conditions. [a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.15,000/- (Rupees Fifteen Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai, and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the respondent police daily at 10.30 a.m., for a period of four weeks, thereafter as and when required for interrogation; [c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he/she is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he/she is suspected; [d] the petitioner shall not abscond either during investigation or trial; [e] the petitioner shall not directly or indirectly make any

inducement, threat or promise to any person acquainted with the facts

of the case so as to dissuade her from disclosing such facts to the Court or to any police officer or tamper with the evidence; [f] On breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned Judicial Magistrate/Trial Court is entitled to take appropriate action against the petitioner in accordance with law as if the conditions have been imposed and the petitioner released on bail by the learned Magistrate/Trial Court himself as laid down by the Hon'ble Supreme Court in P.K.Shaji vs. State of Kerala [(2005)AIR SCW 51730].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 BNS. (K R S J) 02.07.2026 TM To 1.The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Madurai. 2.The Inspector of Police, Teppakulam Police Station, Madurai City. (Crime No.208 of 2026) 3.The Superintendent,

Central Prison, Madurai. 4.The Additional Public Prosecutor, Madurai
Bench of Madras High Court, Madurai.

K. RAJASEKAR, J.

TM

ORDER

IN CRL OP(MD) No. 13116 of 2026 Date : 02.07.2026

SooperKanoon - India's Premier Online Legal Search - sooperkanoon.com