



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

Reserved on : 30.10.2024

Pronounced on : 18.11.2024

CORAM

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice P.DHANABAL

CRL OP.No.24908 of 2024

S. Satheesh S/o. Subramaniam ... Petitioner /Accused-26
Vs

State rep. by:-

The Additional Superintendent of Police,
Economic Offences Wing-II,
HQRS, Chennai. ... Respondent
[Cr. No.7 of 2022]

PRAYER: - The Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 483 of
B.N.S.S., praying to grant bail to the petitioner/Accused in Crime No.7 of
2022 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr. Anirudh A Sriram

For Respondent : Mr. R. Muniyapparaj,
Additional Public Prosecutor,
assisted by
Mr. Sylvester John

ORDER



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

WEB COPY

The petitioner/Accused, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 25.05.2023 for the offences punishable under Sections 409, 120-B, 420, 406, 201, 204, 109, 34 of IPC read with Section 3, 5, 21(1), 21(2), 21(3), 23 and 25 of Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act 2019 and Section 58(B) of Reserve Bank India Act, 1934 and Section 5 of Tamil Nadu Protection of Interests of Depositors (In Financial Establishment) Act 1997 and in Cr. No.7 of 2022 on the file of the respondent police, seeks bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1 Aarudhra Gold Trading Pvt. Ltd., and other accused invited deposits through advertisements in websites and social media at 21 branches in Aminjikarai, Anna Nagar, Perungalathur, Urapakkam, Avadi, Villivakkam, Chengalpattu, Uthiramerur, Tiruvallur, Nemili, Kanchipuram, Aarani, Cheyyar, Mangal SIPCOT, Vellore, Ranipet, Trichy, Madurai, Palayamkottai, Tirunelveli, Hosur and Krishnagiri and had been collecting deposits from the public with false promise of repaying exorbitant interest at the rate of 10% to 30% per month. As per the FIR, Rs.2522.63 crores were collected from 1,09,255 depositors through 30 bank accounts of the company and its



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

Directors from the year 2020 and cheated the depositors. Hence the case.

WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would contend that the respondent police have registered a false case as against this petitioner and he has been arrayed as A26 in this case in Cr. No.7 of 2022 for the alleged offences under Sections 409, 120-B, 420, 406, 201, 204, 109, 34 of IPC read with Section 3, 5, 21(1), 21(2), 21(3), 23 and 25 of Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act 2019 and Section 58(B) of Reserve Bank India Act, 1934 and Section 5 of Tamil Nadu Protection of Interests of Depositors (In Financial Establishment) Act 1997. In fact, this petitioner is only a Staff member at Aarudhra Gold Trading Company, Nemili Branch, Ranipet District and he is not a Director of the A1 company as wrongly alleged by the prosecution. The petitioner is neither connected with the offences nor played any vital role as alleged by the respondent police. He was summoned by the police for enquiry on 11 times on various dates and he had also attended the enquiry and also explained the real things. Further, the respondent police have conducted a raid on the A1 company's Nemili Branch on 24.05.2022, during which



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

WEB COPY

no recoveries were made and the respondent also raided the petitioner's home. However, on 25.05.2023, the respondent police had arrested this petitioner by alleging that this petitioner had collected Rs.73 crores from approximately 5,077 depositors through direct means, promising them exorbitant monthly interest rates of 30% along with gold coin gifts over periods of 10, 12 and 15 months. Already this petitioner filed a petition and the same was dismissed and also he filed a petition for statutory bail under Section 167(2) of Cr.P.C. and the same was also dismissed and thereafter, the said dismissal order was challenged through a Criminal Revision Petition in Crl.R.P. No.1832 of 2023 and the same was also dismissed by this Court and already the investigation was completed and charge sheet was also filed by the respondent police and now the case is pending in C.C. No.9 of 2023. The petitioner is in custody for more than 16 months. There cannot be a Branch Director as alleged by the prosecution. This petitioner is not a named original Director and he is only a Branch Director of A1 company's Nemili Branch. Therefore, the petitioner is no way connected with this crime and hence he prayed to grant bail to the petitioner.



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

WEB COPY

3.1. In support of his contention, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner has relied upon judgments in ***(i) Arvind Kejriwal v. Central Bureau of Investigation in Crl. Appeal No.3816 of 2024 and (ii) Vijay Nair v. Enforcement Directorate in SLP (C) Diary No.22137 of 2024.***

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) would submit that totally there are 40 accused, out of 40 accused A1 to A8 are companies and A9 to A40 are the accused persons. Out of 32 accused, 26 accused were arrested and remanded to judicial custody. This petitioner is arrayed as A26. M/s. Aarudhra Gold Trading Private Limited/A1, so far collected deposits around Rs.2438 crores from about 1,09,255 depositors. The accused have not registered the company under SEBI Act. After registration of charge sheet on 20.05.2022, the principal conspirator Rajasekar Veeraraghavan/A9 along with Usha Vetrivel/A15, Senthilkumar/A12 and Micheal Raj/A14, absconded to Dubai, they concealed the documents related to the investment collection of A1



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

WEB COPY

company on connivance with A35 Chandrakkannan and even destroyed some crucial information stored in the computers. They purposefully diverted huge amount of Cash to Dubai with the help of A38/Pechimuthuraj @ Rafeeq. As far as this petitioner is concerned, This petitioner/A26, as Branch Director of Nemili Branch of A1 company, was involved in the collection of illegal deposits in Nemili and diverted the huge amounts to his personal gains. He had acted as the Director of Nemili Branch of A1 company and defaulted the repayment of around Rs.73 crores of 5077 depositors. He had induced the public through phone calls, whatsapp messages and pamphlets to deposit more and more and collected deposits as in the capacity of Branch Director of A1 Company in Nemili Branch. Huge amount has been diverted to the bank account of this petitioner. Many complaints have been received and micro level investigation is required. The further investigation reveals that the number of complaints and the quantum of money is being increased. In this case, huge money collected from lot of persons, is involved. Some more witnesses have to be examined to find out the truth regarding the diversion of money and transfer of properties done by the



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

petitioner/accused and absconding accused are to be secured. Hence, at this stage, the petition is liable to be dismissed.

4.1. The learned Government Advocate appearing for the State has relied upon the following judgments in support of his contention.

4.1.1. *Y.S. Jagan Mohan Reddy vs. Central Bureau of Investigation reported in 2013(7) SCC 439.*

4.1.2. *State of Gujarat vs. Mohanlal Jitamaji Porwal reported in 1987 Supreme Court Cases 364.*

4.1.3. *Vinod Bhandari vs. State of Madhya Pradesh reported in (2015) 11 Supreme Court Cases.*

4.1.4. *Sohan Singh Rao vs. Union of India reported in (2022) SCC Online Raj 1464.*

4.1.5. *Nimmagadda Prasad vs. Central Bureau of Investigation reported in (2013) 7 Supreme Court Cases 466.*

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

WEB COPY

6. Considering the rival submissions made on either side, considering the fact that as per the prosecution case, there are Managing Directors, Directors, Nominated Directors and Branch Directors and this petitioner comes under the category of Branch Director of Nemili Branch of A1 Company and he was said to be the Director of a particular Branch at Nemili, the petitioner was an employee under the A1 Company and he only acted as collecting agent for the company and he is not a Managing Director or the Director of the company and also he appeared before the respondent police for more than 10 times for enquiry and this petitioner is in judicial custody from 25.05.2023 and there is no previous case pending against this petitioner, investigation was also completed and further investigation is pending in a particular aspect no any properties were recovered from this petitioner during the investigation and already some of the co-accused were released on bail by this Court.

8. As far as the judgments relied on by the learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police are concerned, they will not be applicable to the present case as this petitioner is not a Director or Managing Director of the A1 company and he was the



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

Manager of a particular branch of the main accused company and hence,

I am inclined to grant bail to the petitioner, subject to the following conditions:

[a] Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on condition to execute a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned **Special Judge, Special Court for exclusive trial of cases under Tamil Nadu Protection of Interests of Depositors (In Financial Establishment) Act 1997, Chennai** and on further conditions that:

[b] the petitioner shall report before the Special Judge, Special Court for exclusive trial of cases under Tamil Nadu Protection of Interests of Depositors (In Financial Establishment) Act 1997, Chennai on all working days at 10.30 a.m. until further orders;

[c] the petitioner shall not commit any offence similar to the offence of which he is accused, or suspected, or of the commission of which he is suspected;



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

[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 him 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 5560].

[g] If the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 229A IPC.



WEB COPY



CRL O.P. No.24908 of 2024

18.11.2024

[3/4]

index: Yes/No

Internet: Yes/No

Speaking/Non Speaking order

mjs

P.DHANABAL,J

mjs

To

- 1.The Special Judge, Special Court under the TNPID Act (Financial Establishment) Act, Chennai.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor, Madras High Court, Chennai.
- 3.The Additional Superintendent of Police, Economic Offences Wing-II, HQRS, Chennai.
4. The Superintendent of Police, Central Prison, Puzhal, Chennai.

CRL. O.P. No.24908 of 2024

18.11.2024

[3/4]