



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 14699 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 10-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

**CRL OP No. 14699 of 2025
and Crl MP No.13571 of 2025**

1.ABIRAMI
2.Karthick
3.Nathiya
4.Murugesan

Petitioners

Vs

State Rep. by The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch, Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District. (Crime.No.7/2025)

Respondent(s)

PRAYER Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners on bail in the event of their arrest in Crime.No.7/2025 pending investigation on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.E Kannadasan

For Intervenor: Mr.K.N.Nataraj

For Respondent(s): Mr.A.Gopinath

Government Advocate (Crl.Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 120(B) of IPC, in Crime No.7 of 2025, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioners is that they, being the wife, brother, sister and paternal uncle of A1 who was running a business, induced the defacto complainant to invest in an online trading business along with A1. Accordingly, the defacto complainant invested Rs.73,00,000/-, which was subsequently misappropriated by A1 along with the petitioners.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners submitted that all transactions occurred between 2021 and 2023, while the complaint being lodged later, on the grounds of alleged misappropriation. However, the counsel argued that documents demonstrate full repayment of the amount. It was further contended that A1 and the petitioners, being close relatives, had their bank accounts used by A1, leading to the petitioner's false implication in the case.



Consequently, the counsel prayed for anticipatory bail for the petitioners.

WEB COPY

4.The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that the petitioners induced the defacto complainant to invest a huge amount of Rs.43,00,000/-.

Further, A1 misused the defacto complainant's credit card and withdrew Rs.30,00,000/-, bringing the total swindled amount to Rs.73,00,000/-. The counsel thus opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent reported that there are totally five accused in this case and the petitioners are arrayed as A2 to A5. He submitted that A1 is arrested who is the main accused and he was released on statutory bail and so far no amount is recovered.

6. It is stated that the no amount is recovered, the allegation contained in the FIR and other documents only reveals that major role is played by A1 and he was already arrested and subsequently released on bail. Further FIR in this



case is also registered in the month of April 2025 and now already six month is

7. Considering the above facts and circumstances, the 1st and 3rd petitioners are being women and also the 4th petitioner is aged about 78 years and also the fact that the co-accused/A1 has been enlarged on bail, this Court is of the view that, custodial interrogation of the petitioners are not required for the purpose of investigation, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners with certain conditions.

8. Accordingly, the petitioners are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance, within a period of fifteen (15) days from the date of receipt of a copy of this order before the *learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Krishnagiri* on condition that the petitioners shall execute a separate bond for a sum of **Rs.20,000/- (Rupees Twenty Thousand Only)** **each**, with two sureties, each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the respondent police or the police officer who intends to arrest or to the satisfaction of the



learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that:

WEB COPY

(a) the sureties shall affix their photographs and left thumb impression in the surety bond and the Magistrate may obtain a copy of their Aadhar card or Bank pass Book to ensure their identity;

(b) the first, third and fourth petitioners shall report before the respondent police on everyday at 10.30 a.m. for a period of one week and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

(c) The second petitioner shall report before the respondent police everyday at 10.30 a.m., for a period of three weeks and thereafter as and when required for interrogation.

(d) the petitioners shall not tamper with evidence or witness either during investigation or trial;

(e) the petitioners shall not abscond either during investigation or trial;

(f) on breach of any of the aforesaid conditions, the learned



WEB COPY

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]*; and;

(g) if the accused thereafter absconds, a fresh FIR can be registered under Section 269 of B.N.S.

10-10-2025

1/2

gbi

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No



CRL OP No. 14699 of 2025



To
WEB COPY

- 1.State Rep. by The Inspector of Police
District Crime Branch, Krishnagiri,
Krishnagiri District. (Crime.No.7/2025)
- 2.J.M. No.I, Krishnagiri.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 14699 of 2025



K.RAJASEKAR J.

gbi

**CRL OP No. 14699 of
2025**

10-10-2025