



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 2431 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS
DATED: 19-11-2025

CORAM
THE HON'BLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRL RC No. 2431 of 2025
AND
CRL MP NO. 21831 OF 2025

Kalyani
W/o.R.Ravi Kannan,
DLF Garden City, Tower-26,
14th Floor D-No.2, Chemmencherry,
Chennai-600 119.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The State Rep by,
The Inspector of Police,
CCB, Job Racketing Wing,
Vepery, Chennai.
Cr.No.300/2020.

..Respondent(s)

CRL RC No. 2431 of 2025

To set aside the order passed by the Learned CCB-CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in Crl.M.P.NO.21715/2023 in CC No.3141/2023 dated 23/07/2025.

CRL MP No. 21831 of 2025

To stay all further proceedings of the case in CC No.3141/2023 on the file of the Learned CCB-CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai pending disposal of the Revision.

For Petitioner(s): Ms.A.Madhumathi

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



Order

Challenging the impugned order passed by the CCEB-CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai in Crl.M.P.No. 21715 of 2023 in C.C.No.3141 of 2023 dated 23.07.2025, the petitioner/A2 preferred this Criminal Revision Case.

2. Before the trial court, the petitioner filed a petition under Sec.239 of Cr.P.C. seeking to discharge her from the proceedings stating that she has been falsely implicated in this case, in fact Geetha Rajkumar alone involved in job racketing by collecting amount from various persons nor she dealt with entire money, however, her husband was implicated as accused. Therefore, she pleaded innocence and prayed to discharge her from the proceedings. The said petition was strongly objected by the prosecution stating that the prosecution witnesses clearly deposed the involvement of this petitioner, who is wife of A1 also involved in collecting amount by giving false promise to secure the Government jobs in various departments and to that effect, statements were also recorded from the witnesses. Considering the same, the trial judge held that there is prima facie materials with regard to involvement of this petitioner along with other accused is established by the prosecution. Therefore, the petition was dismissed as no merit. Aggrieved over that, the petitioner preferred this Criminal Revision Case by raising the following grounds for consideration :-



WEB COPY

- (a) The lower court ought to have seen that prima facie no offence is made out against the petitioner Kalyani and her name is implicated only by the 3rd accused and the same is having no evidential proof.
- (b) The lower court erred in dismissing the discharge petition inspite of the fact that the petitioner's involvement in the crime was not at all established through the 161 CrI.P.C. Statement of witnesses.
- (c) The lower court ought to have seen that mere suspicion however strong it may be cannot considered to be a proof or an evidence against the petitioner and there are no material particulars to implicate the accused in the main case.
- (d) The lower court ought to have seen that the petitioner Kalyani's involvement in the commission of the offence is not proved through any of the witness or documents in this case and the only role played by her is being the wife of A1 Ravi Kannan and that is not sufficient to file a criminal case against her.
- (e) The lower court ought to have seen that as per the prosecution case it was the complainant A3 Mrs. Geetha Rajkumar was the one, who collected money from the victims to case on the pretext of getting a Government job, and that is the reason, the Hon'ble High Court Court was pleased to direct the prosecution to implead as one of the accused.

By submitting the above grounds, the learned counsel for petitioner would submit that A3/Geetha Rajkumar had received all the amounts from various



persons by giving false promise to get a Government job in various departments. Since the petitioner, being wife of A1, she was falsely implicated in this case, but there is no prima facie material to implicate this petitioner. In spite of that, the trial judge has dismissed the petition. Hence, he prayed to set aside the findings of trial judge.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) would submit that the prosecution witnesses nearly about P.W.1 to P.W.8 were examined and all the witnesses have clearly deposed that she along with her husband had also received the amount by giving false hope to the witnesses. To that effect, they have produced prima facie materials. Therefore, the trial court has rightly dismissed the petition, which needs no interference of this court.

4. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

5. On perusal of records, it reveals the fact that it is a case of job racketing, nearly about Rs.1,22,00,000/- involved and the victims were nearly about 14 persons were suffered. Based on the complaint, F.I.R. was lodged and as per the prosecution case, A1 to A3 have committed an offence under Sec.406, 420, 465, 468 r/w 34 of I.P.C. Now, the petitioner/A2 preferred this Criminal Revision Case to discharge her from the proceedings stating that since because she is wife of A1, she was falsely implicated in this case, A3 alone had received the amount and she was not benefited by any of the amount and hence, she prayed to discharge her from the charges.



6. On seeing the prima facie materials, witnesses deposed about the involvement of this accused with regard to false hope in getting Government jobs in various departments. Furthermore, A1 and A2 have received the amount to secure the job in T.N.E.B. along with A3 and to that effect, witnesses have also given evidence. To that effect, the prima facie materials are available, which requires detailed investigation. Therefore, the reasons assigned by the trial court requires no interference of this court. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed and the findings rendered in Crl.M.P.No. 21715 of 2023 in C.C.No. 3141 of 2023 by the CCB-CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai is confirmed. Consequently, connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is closed.

19-11-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

RPP

To

1. CCB-CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate, Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Inspector of Police, CCB, Job Racketing Wing, Vepery, Chennai.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 2431 of 2



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

RPP

**CRL RC No. 2431 of 2025
AND
CRL MP NO. 21831 OF 2025**

19-11-2025