



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 23565 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

**DATED: 26-08-2025**

CORAM

**THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE N. SATHISH KUMAR**

**CRL OP No. 23565 of 2025**

**and**

**Crl.M.P.No.16057 of 2025**

1. Vimal Arokiaraj Vincent

S/o.Vincent Jayabal,

2. Nithya @ Arul Lourder Nithia

W/o.Vimal Arokiyaraj Vincent,

3. S.Arul Mary

W/o.Vincent Jayabal,

Petitioner(s)

Vs

1. State rep by the Inspector of Police

Central Crime Branch CCB, Namakkal,

Namakkal District

2.Harshavarthan

S/o.Ravi,

Respondent(s)

**PRAYER**

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed under Section 528 of BNSS to call for the entire records in Cr.No.10/2023 dated 08.12.2023 with respect to the 1st petitioner/1st Accused, 2nd petitioner/2nd Accused and 3rd petitioner/3rd Accused pending on the file of Central Crime Branch CCB, Namakkal, Namakkal District to quash the same.

For Petitioner(s): M/s.T.R.Kumaravel

For Respondent(s): Mr. R.Vinothraja,  
Govt. Advocate (crl.side)

**ORDER**

This Criminal Original Petition has been filed seeking to quash the FIR in Crime No.10 of 2023 pending on the file of the first respondent.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioners would submit that the defacto complainant/2<sup>nd</sup> respondent is a partner in the first petitioner's company. A sum of Rs.50 lakhs was contributed by the defacto complainant to the company account and the said amount was invested in the business of the first petitioner's company. Subsequently, dispute arose between the parties regarding their



WEB COPY

respective shares. Hence, the defacto complainant asked the return of the entire amount of Rs.50 lakhs. Since the said amount was invested in the business, the first petitioner was not in a position to withdraw the entire amount immediately. However, the first petitioner had paid a sum of Rs.16 lakhs on various dates to the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent/defacto complainant. Though the first petitioner sought some more time to pay the balance sum of Rs.34 lakhs, the 2<sup>nd</sup> respondent has lodged a false complaint against the first petitioner and his family members over this monetary dispute.

3. It is further contended by the learned counsel for the petitioners that the entire prosecution is civil in nature and therefore, the FIR against them is liable to be quashed.

4. Heard the learned Government Advocate (crl.side) appearing for the first respondent.

5. On perusal of the FIR, though it appears to be a financial transaction,



the allegations subsequently made seems to be deception may have been played from the inception of deposit.

WEB COPY

6. In such view of the matter, a detailed investigation is required in this matter and hence, this is not a fit case for quashing the FIR at this stage. It is for investigation officer to investigate matter in accordance with law. Hence, I find no merit in this Criminal Original Petition.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed. Consequently, connected miscellaneous petition is closed.

**26-08-2025**

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

mrp

To

Inspector of Police  
Central Crime Branch CCB, Namakkal,  
Namakkal District



WEB COPY

CRL OP No. 23565 of 2025



**N.SATHISH KUMAR J.**

mrp

**CRL OP No. 23565 of 2025**

**26-08-2025**