



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

Crl.O.P.Nos. 14435 & 1165 of 2025

1.Bhim Singh	..Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.14435/2025
2.Derendhar Singh @ Dhirendra	..Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.1165/2025
3. Bhagwan Singh	..Petitioner in Crl.O.P.No.1165/2025

Vs.

The State
Rep by Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-I, Chennai.

...Respondent
[In both petitions]

Common Prayer: Criminal Original Petitions filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Cr.No. 185 of 2024 on the file of the respondent police, pending investigation.

In Crl.O.P.No. 14435/2025:

For Petitioner	:	Mr.T.Velmariappan
For Respondent	:	Mr.S.Udayakumar Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

In Crl.O.P.No. 1165/2025:

For Petitioner	:	Mr.R.C.Paul Kanagaraj
For Intervenor	:	Mr.P.N. Vignesh
For Respondent	:	Mr.S.Udayakumar Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



COMMON ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 120B and 109 of IPC in Crime No.185 of 2024 on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that the de-facto complainant along with his father who have been running gold business for the past 25 years. In such circumstances, the accused persons had brought Rs.1,00,000/- as hand loan from the de-facto complainant and the accused had not returned back 200 gms of gold to the de-facto complainant. On 21.06.2024, the accused persons had purchased 1600 gms of gold and assured that the de-facto complainant that he would give old gold ornaments on the same day, but the accused persons had not given the same. Thereafter, the de-facto complainant went to the accused shop and found the shop was locked, later, it came to light that the accused persons had cheated several other persons in the same manner. Hence the case.



WEB COPY

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and they have been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that there is no prima facie material on the side of the de-facto complainant before the Trial Court where, the de-facto complainant initiated a private complaint. He further submitted that the petitioners are ready to abide any conditions imposed by this Court. He prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Counsel appearing for the Intervenor submitted that he has strongly objected for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent reiterated the prosecution case, submits that a status report was filed. He further submits that the properties have not been recovered from the accused so far. He further submits that investigation is on. He further submits that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners are required in this case. Therefore, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY

6. On perusal of FIR and other connected records, it reveals that the petitioners along with other co-accused had received 11752 sovereigns of gold jewels from 15 victims and the de-facto complainant by replacing the old gold jewels and thereafter, the accused had cheated the de-facto complainant and others. Till date, no recovery has been made from the accused. Hence, this Court is of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required in this case. Accordingly, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners and the same is liable to be dismissed.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

12.11.2025

ssi

To:

1. Rep by Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch-I, Chennai.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.,

MSM

Crl.O.P.Nos. 14435 & 1165 of 2025

12.11.2025