



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 25144 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 24.09.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR.JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL OP NO.25144 of 2025

1.Malliga
2.Elumalai

..Petitioners/A3 & A4

Vs

The State rep. by
The Inspector of Police
Redhills Police Station
Chennai District.
Crime No. 374 of 2025.

....Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioners./A3&A4 on bail in the event of their arrest pending investigation in Cr.No. 374 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioners : Mr.M.Vetrivel
For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar
Government Advocate (Criminal Side)



ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420, 465, 468, 471, 506(ii) IPC in Crime No. 374 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioners is that the petitioners along with other accused had received a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant under the promise of arranging a job to the daughter of defacto complainant in the Railway Department. After receiving money, the petitioners along with others had also issued fake call letter dated 14.10.2020 and appointment order dated 30.11.2020 to the de-facto complainant. Later, she came to know that they were forged. Based on the complaint given by the de-facto complainant, the respondent police registered an FIR against the petitioners and others.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submits that the 1st petitioner is the sister of the de-facto complainant and she has not received any amount from the de-facto complainant. He further submits that the petitioners



have been falsely implicated in this case. He submits that the petitioners have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He also submits that the petitioners are ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed by this Court and ready to furnish sufficient solvent sureties for their release. Hence, he prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that both the petitioners herein had actively participated in the crime and they had received a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant through various bank transactions. He further submits that after receiving the said amount, the petitioners had issued fake call letter as well as appointment order to the de-facto complainant. The aforesaid amount has not yet received by the de-facto complainant, no one has been arrested in this case and investigation has been pending against them. Hence, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

5. Taking note of the serious allegations attributed against the



Crl.OP.No. 25144 of 2025

petitioners and also considering the fact that huge amount had been involved in the offence and no amount has been recovered from the petitioners; that investigation is pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

24.09.2025

MSM

To

1.The Inspector of Police
Redhills Police Station
Chennai District.
Crime No. 374 of 2025.

2. The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No. 25144 of 2025

K. RAJASEKAR, J.,

MSM

CRL OP NO. 25144 of 2025

2n4.09.2025