



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 12.11.2025

CORAM

WEB COPY

**THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI**

Crl.O.P.No.30136 of 2025

G.Subramani

... Petitioner/A1

Vs.

The State

Rep by Inspector of Police,

District Crime Branch

Salem District.

...Respondent

Crime No. 11 of 2025.

**PRAYER :** Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest pending investigation in Crime No. 11 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.Rajaguru Chinnamuthu

For Respondent : Mr.S.Udayakumar

Government Advocate, Criminal Side

### **ORDER**

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 120B, 294(b), 417, 420 and



506(i) of IPC in Crime No. 11 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner along with other accused had received to the tune of Rs.80,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant under the pretext of “High Returns”. Thereafter, they had failed to return the said amount and cheated the de-facto complainant. Hence, the respondent police registered an FIR based on the complaint given by him.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that as of now, the petitioner along with others had already paid Rs.40,00,000/-. He further submits that the dispute arose between the petitioners 7 others and the de-facto complainant is civil in nature. He further submits that the petitioner is ready to abide any condition imposed by this Court. Therefore, the learned Counsel prays for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

2/5



WEB COPY

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent, reiterated the prosecution case and submits that the de-facto complainant is a retired Additional Superintendent of Police. While he was working at Salem, the petitioner along with others had approached him to invest a real estate business to the tune of Rs.80,00,000/- under the guise of “getting high returns”. Based on their assurance, the de-facto complainant had invested the amount on various modes. After receiving the same, the petitioner along with others had cheated the de-facto complainant. He further submits that till date, no amount has been recovered from the petitioner and others. Therefore, he opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Taking note of the fact that the gravity of offence committed by the petitioner; that no amount has been recovered from the petitioner so far; that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required in this case; that if anticipatory bail is granted to the petitioner he would indulge in similar



offences in future, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

12.11.2025

1/2

MSM

To:

1.The Inspector of Police,  
District Crime Branch  
Salem District.  
Crime No. 11 of 2025.

2.The Public Prosecutor,  
High Court of Madras.

**T.V.THAMILSELVI, J.,**

MSM



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.30136 of 2025

12.11.2025