



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 07-10-2025

CORAM

WEB COPY

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRL RC No. 1937 of 2025

Ge Tek Electronics Pvt Limited

Represented by its Director Authorized

Signatory, E.Gunasekaran, age -48

Shed No.8, Phase VI,

SIDCO Industrial Estate,

Marailamalai Nagar,

Chennai – 603 209.

Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep By Its,

The Inspector of Police,

CCD 1 Tambaram Police Station,

Tambaram Commissionerate

Sholinganallur - 600 119

Respondent(s)

PRAYER

To set aside the condition No.I imposed in the Judgment dated 22.05.2025 in Crl.M.P.No.1350 of 2025 on the file of the Learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpet.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.S.Shivram

For Respondent(s): Dr.C.E.Pratap,
Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)



ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenging the impugned conditions imposed in the judgment dated 22.05.2025 in Crl.M.P.No. 1350 of 2025 on the file of Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpet, the petitioner preferred this Criminal Revision Case.

2. The learned counsel for petitioner would submit that he is the victim under the hands of accused, who had looted nearly about Rs.3,90,00,000/- through online bank fraud. According to the petitioner, the accused involved in online bank fraud. On believing her words, the petitioner made financial transaction nearly about Rs.3,90,00,000/- through cheque and thereafter, the petitioner came to know about the scam made by the accused. Hence, they gave a complaint, based on that, the F.I.R. was lodged and during the investigation, the respondent police had seized the accused account, however, the accused bank account was frozen along with money belongs to the petitioner. Hence, they have filed a petition for return of cash to the tune of Rs.7,96,933.92/-. On perusal of records, the trial court allowed the petition on the following conditions:-

- i) the petitioner shall execute a bond for Rs.8,00,000/- (Rupees Eight lakhs only) along with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the court;
- ii) The petitioner is directed to return the amount of Rs.7,96,933.92/- as and when directed by the court.

Now, challenging the impugned conditions imposed by the trial court, the



petitioner had preferred this Criminal Revision Case.

3. Learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for respondent raised objections, but admits that all those amounts made in the name of accused account was frozen by the respondent police during the investigation. However, according to the petitioner, a sum of Rs.3,90,00,000/- was cheated by the accused.

4. Considering both side submissions and on perusal of records, the fact reveals that the respondent police had frozen the amounts made in the name of accused account along with the money belongs to the petitioner during the investigation. Therefore, the petitioner is entitled for the amount, but the conditions (i) and (ii) imposed by the trial court as such is unwarranted, liable to be set aside. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is allowed and the conditions (i) and (ii) imposed by the trial court in Crl.M.P.No. 1350 of 2025 is set aside. However, the petitioner is entitled to receive the amount, since they have already given the undertaking affidavit before the trial court. The other conditions shall remain unaltered.

07-10-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

smn



WEB COPY

1. Judicial Magistrate No.II, Chengalpet.
2. The Inspector of Police, CCD 1, Tambaram Police Station, Tambaram
Commissionerate, Sholinganallur – 600 119.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1937 of 2025





WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 1937 of 2025



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

smn

**CRL RC No. 1937 of
2025**

07-10-2025