



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.20731 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 09.10.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.20731 of 2025

Nithya Rajendran

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Rep by
The Inspector of Police
CCB-1
Chennai

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the
event of arrest pending investigation in Crime No.264 of 2023 on the file of
the Inspector of Police,CCB-1,Chennai

For Petitioners : M/s.K.M.Selvakumar

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

For Intervenor : Mr.K.Sudhakar

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent
police for the offences punishable under Sections 120(B), 34, 406 and 420
of IPC in Crime No. 264 of 2023, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks
anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2.The allegation against this petitioner is that the petitioner is the Director of the company which involved in investment fraud and totally a sum of Rs.1.12 crores was collected from 43 victims and subsequently, they have cheated the depositors. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submits that the petitioner is an innocent person and she has been falsely implicated in this case. He also submits that the petitioner is one of the Director and all the business transactions were carried out by other accused persons. He also submits that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to furnish sufficient solvent sureties for her release. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submits that huge amount has been swindled by inducing the defacto complainant and other depositors to invest in the accused company and subsequently, they were cheated by the accused persons. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that totally there are nine accused in this case and the petitioner/A2, who is the Director of the company, actively participated in the business activities. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the allegations against the petitioners, submissions made by the learned counsels on either side, considering the fact that huge amount has been cheated by the accused company and the petitioner is the Director of the company and also the fact that so far, no amount has been recovered, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

09.10.2025

nr

To

1. The Inspector of Police
CCB-1, Chennai

2. The Public Prosecutor
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.20731 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

nr

Crl.O.P.No.20731 of 2025

**09.10.2025
(2/2)**