



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.388 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: **29-01-2025**

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA

CRL OP NO. 388 of 2025

C.Soundararajan

Petitioner(s) /A-9

Vs

The State represented by,
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Salem.

Crime No.12 of 2024

Narendrakumar

Respondent(s)
Intervenor/defacto complainant

For Petitioner(s):

M/s.S.Sridevi

For Respondent(s):

Mr.S.Santhosh
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor(s):

Mr.D.Ravichandran

ORDER

Apprehending arrest in connection with Crime No.12 of 2024 registered for the offences punishable under Sections 120(B), 467, 408 and 409 of Indian Penal Code, the present petition has been filed seeking anticipatory bail.



Crl.O.P.No.388 of 2025

2. The case of the prosecution is that, the accused who was working as Manager, Team Leader and Relationship Executives in the Sriram Finance, Kolathur Branch, Salem by fabrication of documents and forged loan applications cheated the company to the tune of Rs.1,11,20,000/-. Hence the case.

3. Pleading innocence on the part of the petitioner, false implication in the case, learned counsel for the petitioner seeks indulgence of this court. He would submit that the customers have given fabricated documents and on believing the same, the petitioner has released the amount. She would further submit that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court.

4. The case of the prosecution as putforth by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police, opposing for grant of anticipatory bail is that, the second accused, Silamparasan, who was working as Branch Team Leader in the defacto complainant's company, along with other Executives by furnishing false loan applications had cheated the company to the tune of Rs.1,11,20,000/-. He would further submit that custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required.



Crl.O.P.No.388 of 2025

WEB COPY

5. Learned counsel appearing for the intervenor/defacto complainant submitted that the accused who was employed in the company as Manager, Team Leader, Executives has conspired together and cheated the company to the tune of Rs.1,11,20,000/-. He would submit that the huge public money is involved and he vehemently objected for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Having heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) for the respondent Police, the learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant and perused the materials available on record, considering the facts and the submissions, this court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

29.01.2025

(9/13)

dsn



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.388 of 2025

A.D.JAGADISH CHANDIRA, J.

dsn

Crl.O.P.No.388 of 2025

29.01.2025

(9/13)