



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 05.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.28232 of 2025

1. Karthikeyan

2. Uma

... Petitioners

Vs

The State Rep. by
The Inspector of Police,
Thirumullaivoyal Police Station,
Chennai District.
(Crime No.300 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the Petitioner/Accused in Crime
No.300 of 2025 pending on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.P.Nagaraju

For Intervenor : Mr.K.Kandhan

For Respondent : Mr.A.Gopinath
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioners herein apprehending arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(4) of
BNS, 2023 in Crime No.300 of 2025, registered on the file of the
respondent, seeks anticipatory bail.



WEB COPY

2. The case of the prosecution is that A1, while working under the defacto complainant's firm and taking advantage of his access to the payments received on behalf of the defacto complainant, diverted a sum of Rs.22,60,000/-. It is further alleged that the first petitioner received a sum of Rs.35,000/- and the second petitioner, namely Uma, also received a portion of the said amount. Hence, it is alleged that all the three persons colluded and diverted the amount belonging to the defacto complainant, pursuant to which the present case has been registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners have already handed over a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- to the defacto complainant and that the remaining amount was taken back by A1. It was further submitted that the amount was deposited into the account of A2 with her consent and that there was no misuse. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted that the total amount involved in this case is Rs.22,60,000/- and that no amount has been recovered so far. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.



WEB COPY

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that A1 is absconding and that the total amount involved in this case is Rs.22,60,000/-, which has not been recovered. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, the magnitude of the amount involved and the fact that A1 is absconding, this Court is of the view that grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioners would hamper the investigation. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

05.11.2025

kmm



To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Thirumullaivoyal Police Station,
Chennai District.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

WEB COPY



WEB COPY



K. RAJASEKAR

kmm

CRL.O.P.No.28232 of 2025

05.11.2025