



WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 22-10-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO.20158 of 2025

Balaji Santhanam

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Represented by
Inspector of Police,
CBCID, Salem.
Crime No.03 of 2025.

Respondent(s)

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 in connection with Crime No.03 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.L.Ramu

For Respondent(s): Mr.S.Udayakumar, Government Advocate (Crl.side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 419, 465, 468, 471, 420 IPC & 66D Information Technology Act 2000, Section 3 r/w 5 of Emblems and Name Act, 1950 in Crime No.03 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Ayyamperumal gave an information to RBI stating that some un-identified persons collecting amount from the public to give money to the officers of RBI for releasing certain funds received from the Central Government for sale of iridium copper and based on the information, the Assistant General Manager, RBI lodged a complaint. The investigation revealed that some victims were approached by petitioner and other accused, by claiming that, they need investors to fund them, for the purpose of paying kickbacks to officers of RBI, in order to collect foreign funds for several crores and by their modus huge amounts were collected by the accused group. Hence, this case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an unnamed accused in the FIR and has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the co-accused was released on bail by this Court in CrI.OP.No.21880 of 2025 dated 11.09.2025. He further submitted that the petitioner was not aware of the serious allegations levelled against some of the other arrested accused and, therefore, prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the petitioner along with other accused was involved in various types of malpractices and had also fabricated bogus documents. He further submitted that the petitioner also actively participated in this case and received the cheated money collected from the victims, hence opposed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) and perused the materials available on record.

6. On perusal of the statements of the arrested persons, it was revealed that they were actively involved in collecting money, canvassing various individuals, exchanging and fabricating documents and benefiting from sharing the cheated amount. Although it is stated that the co-accused was released on bail, the order of this Court shows that the role of the petitioner therein, taking note of the overt act, has been granted anticipatory bail. However, regarding this petitioner is concerned, the situation is different. Therefore, the order has not been considered for the grant of anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

7. Considering the above facts and circumstances of the case and the gravity of the offences alleged against the petitioner, this Court is of the view that granting anticipatory bail to the petitioner at this stage would likely hamper the progress of the investigation.

8. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

22-10-2025

drl

To

1.The Inspector of Police,
CBCID, Salem.

2.The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.,

drl

CRL OP NO.20158 of 2025

22.10.2025