IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

RESERVED ON: 22.08.2025
PRONOUNCED ON: 29.08.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE M.NIRMAL KUMAR

Crl.O.P.No.23051 of 2025 and
Crl.M.P.No.15777 of 2025

Vijayakumar ... Petitioner

Vs.

State rep by
Inspector of Police,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
ACB Chennai. ... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition is filed under Section 528 of BNSS, to call for the records relating to C.C.No.49 of 2011 pending on file of XI Additional Special Judge CBI, Chennai and quash the charge sheet vide No.38.

For Petitioner : Ms.S.K.Pushppasri

For Respondent : Mr.K.Srinivasan,
Special Public Prosecutor for CBI Cases

ORDER

This Criminal Original Petition is filed to call for the records relating to C.C.No.49 of 2011 pending on file of XI Additional Special Judge CBI, Chennai and quash the Charge Sheet.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the Assistant General Manager, Union Bank of India, Regional Office, Salem, lodged a complaint to the respondent seeking to initiate legal action against one G.Kasinathan, Branch Manager, Union Bank of India, Thiruvannamalai Branch, who connived with the dealers and agents and borrowers in the sanction and disbursement of various agricultural loans. The said Kasinathan was posted to the Union Bank of India, Thiruvannamalai Branch on 15.12.2008 and he along with one V.Kannan were holding the post of Branch Manager till 21.12.2008. Thereafter V.Kannan got transferred and the said Kasinathan acted as Branch Manager till 29.06.2009. The said Kasinathan in connivance with M/s.Annamalayar Motors, M/s. Aruneshwara Hi-Tech, M/s.Om Motors, M/s.Sakthivel Engineering Works, M/s.Shri Shivamalai Motors, M/s.Vijay

Agro Agencies and other dealers of Tractors and Power Tillers, sanctioned and disbursed 66 agricultural loans including crop loans on different dates to the borrowers without proper documents and with forged documents and the amount not utilized for the purpose for which it was granted. This was found out during internal inspection. The said Kasinathan, Branch Manager without properly processing the records submitted by the borrowers without proper credit appraisal, without enquiry with the borrowers, without pre-sanction inspection as per Bank norms and guidelines, sanctioned 66 agricultural loans. The loans sanctioned were disbursed through Pay orders to the dealers concerned but the dealers not delivered the Tractors/Power Tillers and its accessories to the borrowers. The bills submitted found without serial numbers, invoice and delivery challan without engine and chassis number which are the primary requirement to confirm supply of said items to the loanees. No post-sanction inspection conducted. The Tractors/Tillers not physically verified. The Pay orders received by the dealers were credited to the respective accounts, the amounts withdrawn by the dealers, a portion of the loan amount given to the borrowers, without actual supply of tractors and power tillers and thereby siphoned off the loan amount. Hence, a complaint lodged. On receipt of the complaint, a case in RCMA12010A0023 was registered which lead to filing of five charge sheets. As regards C.C.No.49 of 2011, the petitioner is arrayed as A2 and along with him, two others are being prosecuted.

3.The primary contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner is that the Assistant General Manager, Union Bank of India on the same day lodged a complaint to the respondent for a similar offence against V.Kannan, Branch Manager, Union Bank of India, Thiruvannamalai Branch for identical misdeeds and a case in RCMA12010A0022 registered and investigated which lead to filing of six charge sheets in C.C.Nos.4, 5, 6 , 7, 9 and 10 of 2012. The petitioner/A2 is only a Salesman at M/s.Ramajayam Tractors, Tiruvannamalai. The allegation is that the petitioner filled up the loan documents for the beneficiaries with false particulars. The signature in the withdrawal form in the name of borrower R.Perumal was found to be forged. Likewise the forged documents created in the name of Deenadayalan. Thus the petitioner along with the Branch Manager and one Anjana cheated the bank. The petitioner earlier arrayed as accused and convicted in C.C.Nos.4, 5, 9 and 11 of 2012. The petitioner preferred appeals before this Court in Crl.A.No.680 of 2018, Crl.A.No.682 of 2018, Cr.A.Nos.683 of 2018 and Crl.A.No.684 of 2018. This Court by judgment dated 10.10.2023 modified the conviction and sentence and partly allowed the appeals in Crl.A.No.680 of 2018, Crl.A.No.682 of 2018 and Cr.A.No.683 of 2018. Further, this Court by judgment dated 10.10.2023 allowed the appeal in Crl.A.No.684 of 2018 by setting aside the conviction and sentence. Challenging the judgment passed by this Court by modifying the sentence, the petitioner preferred Special Leave Petitions before the Apex Court in SLP(Crl.).Nos.4530, 15951 and 2426 of 2024. She would submit petitioner already convicted for similar cause of action, now for the same offence and for the same transaction, the petitioner is being again tried in C.C.No.49 of 2011 and the witnesses are almost the same and facts are identical. She would further submit that since the petitioner already tried and convicted in a previous trial for same set of facts forming part of a single transaction. The petitioner cannot be again prosecuted as per Section 300 Cr.P.C. and Article 20(2) of Constitution of India. The Trial Court ought to have clubbed and tried together all cases, finding all arises out of the same transaction as per Sections 219 and 220 of Cr.P.C. Further, the charge under Prevention of Corruption Act simplicitor is legally untenable. The petitioner is not a public servant and he is a private individual and does not come within the definition of Section 2(c) of the Prevention of Corruption Act. The Trial Court failed to consider that the above proceedings arise of same series of acts and continuing conspiracy, there cannot be separate conspiracy for each case since the same modus operandi is projected against the petitioner and the witnesses are all common. Since the petitioner already tried in previous trial in C.C.Nos.4, 5, 9 and 11 of 2012 and convicted by the Trial Court and the conviction is in subsistence for the same offence, second prosecution not permitted in view of Section 300 Cr.P.C. She further submitted that Section 300 Cr.P.C. is based on the maxim *nemo debet bis vexari, si constat curiae quod sit pro una et eadem cause.* Thus Section 300 Cr.P.C. bars the trial of a person not only for the same offence but also for any other offence on the same set of facts. Hence the above case is barred, Double Jeopardy.

4.In support of her submissions, the learned counsel for the petitioner relied on the decision of High Court of Bombay in ***Mohit Bharatiya v. State of Maharashtra*** reported in ***2024 SCC OnLine Bom 3666*** and the decision o High Court of Allahabad in ***Kameshwar and Another v. State*** reported in ***1958 Cri LJ 583(2)*** for the point that where there are number of offences alleged to have been committed in pursuance of criminal conspiracy, the link which unites the various offences is the link of conspiracy so that whatever be the offence committed in pursuance of the conspiracy, there would be atleast one single crime which the accused is said to have been committed in respect of all of them. Further, relied on the decision of this Court in ***Vishwalingasamy and others v. The Inspector of Police, Uthukuli Police Station, Tirupur*** reported in ***2021 SCC OnLine Mad 14746*** for the point that once the Court finds that the person has been already charged, convicted then inherent powers under Section 482 Cr.P.C can be invoked and charge sheet can be quashed.

5.The learned Special Public Prosecutor for CBI Cases appearing for the respondent strongly opposed the petitioner's submissions and submitted that offences charged against the petitioner might appear to be similar or same, but the facts of each case are not one and the same. In RCMA12010A0023, the offence was committed during the tenure of G.Kasinathan/A1, the Branch Manager from 15.12.2008 to 29.06.2009 of Tiruvannamalai Branch. As regards RCMA12010A0022, it was during the tenure of V.Kannan, Branch Manager during the period from February 2008 to December 2008. Hence, the Principal conspirator are different. Further, modus operandi might appear to be same but the dealers and beneficiaries are different. The petitioner/A2 submitted loan application in the name of R.Perumal to the Bank for crop loan and a sum of Rs.50,000/- was sanctioned in the name of R.Perumal by A1/G.Kasinathan. The signature in the withdrawal form is also not that of the borrower R.Perumal and he denied to have applied for crop loan from the Bank. Thus, A1/G.Kasinathan in connivance with the petitioner/A2 siphoned off the money and cheated the Union Bank of India, Tiruvannamalai Branch to the tune of Rs.50,000/-. Likewise, the petitioner in connivance with A1/G.Kasinathan and A3/Anjana submitted false loan application in the name of Deendayalan for availing crop loan of Rs.50,000/-. Thus, the accused actively participated in pursuant to the conspiracy, thereby cheated the bank.

6.He further submitted that as per Section 300 Cr.P.C, it is clear that a person who is once tried by a Court of competent jurisdiction for an offence and convicted or acquitted of such offence shall, while such conviction or acquittal remains in force, not be liable to be tried again for the same offence on the same facts. In this case, the facts are totally different, the agricultural land documents, revenue records, all forged in different names. The beneficiaries are different. The petitioner participated in Trial in C.C.Nos.4, 5, 9 and 11 of 2012., during trial the petitioner not raised any objections of similarity of case, filed any petition to try all cases simultaneously, now after conviction, dismissal of appeal filed the above petition to protract the trial. In this case, the facts are totally different. In this case, the trial is at the advanced stage. At this stage, the present petition has been filed. Hence, prayed for dismissal.

7.Considering the rival submissions and on perusal of the materials, it is seen that modus adopted by the petitioner might appear to be similar but the facts of the case are different. The conspirators and conspiracy might look identical but are in variance. In this case, A1 accepted the forged loan documents created by the petitioner/A2 and A3/Anjana and without verifying the genuineness of the same, sanctioned the loan and disbursed the amount. The petitioner/A2 had withdrawn the amount from the accounts pursuant to the conspiracy. It is seen that the petitioner created loan application in the name of R.Perumal and submitted in the Bank for crop loan. In the said loan application, there is no date mentioned and the documents were filled up by the petitioner. Further forged adangal submitted and the signature of the borrower R.Perumal is also forged. The wife of R.Perumal was shown as guarantor in the loan application but it is found to be forged. Likewise in the loan applications of Munusamy and Deenadayalan, forged adangal produced. The said Deenadayalan was examined P.W.13 in this case. It is also seen that in this case, the trial is at the advanced stage. In view of the above, the contention of the petitioner is not sustainable.

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

29.08.2025

Index:Yes/No
Speaking Order/Non-Speaking Order
cse/vv2

To

1.The XI Additional Special Judge CBI,
Chennai.

2.The Inspector of Police,
Central Bureau of Investigation,
ACB Chennai.

3.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

M.NIRMAL KUMAR, J.

cse/vv2

Pre-delivery order made in

Crl.O.P.No.23051 of 2025

29.08.2025