



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 2372 of 2025



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 17-11-2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MRS.JUSTICE T.V.THAMILSELVI

CRL RC No. 2372 of 2025

AND

CRL MP NO. 21458 OF 2025

V.C.Maniraj @ Manikandan
S/o.Chinraj
Pothigai Nagar, 15, Velam Palayam,
Tiruppur

Petitioner(s)

Vs

State through Deputy Superintendent
of Police
Tiruppur EOW II
Cr.No.1/2023

Respondent(s)

CRL RC No. 2372 of 2025

PRAYER

To set aside the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.233 of 2025 in CC.No.19 of 2013 dated 29.10.2025 on the file of the learned Special Judge, Special Court under TNPID Act, Coimbatore

CRL MP No. 21458 of 2025

PRAYER

To stay the order passed in Crl.M.P.No.233 of 2025 in CC.No.19 of 2013 dated 29.10.2025 on the file of the learned Special Judge, Special Court under TNPID Act, Coimbatore

For Petitioner(s): Mr. N.Ranjith

For Respondent(s): Dr.C.E.Pratap,



Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

WEB COPY

Challenging the impugned order passed by the Special Judge, Special Court under NTPID Act, Coimbatore in Crl.M.P.No.233 of 2025 in C.C.No.19 of 2013, dated 29.10.2025, the petitioner/3rd accused preferred this Criminal Revision Petition.

2. The learned counsel for petitioner prayed to set aside the findings of trial court by raising the following grounds for consideration :-

- (a) The learned Special Judge did not consider, if the accounts are not scrutinised, the petitioner has to pay twice.
- (b) The learned Special Judge failed to appreciate the documentary evidence of 7 bank managers. If the 7 bank accounts are tallied, the default amount will reduce to 40 crores.

By submitting the aforesaid grounds, the learned counsel for petitioner would submit that the trial judge has failed to appreciate the facts that if the bank statements are verified, the total default liability would not be arrived. Hence, he prayed to issue summons to the Bank Manager to be examined as defence side witnesses. The said petition was erroneously dismissed by the trial court without appreciating the facts.

3. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) raised objections stating that at the time of examination of defense side witness, he came forward with the said petition. Even in the earlier occasion also, another accused filed similar petition seeking the same set of relief and the same has also not been considered by the trial court. Therefore, he prayed to dismiss this Criminal Revision Case.



4. On perusal of records, it reveals the fact that before the trial court, this petitioner has filed the petition to issue summonses to the Bank Managers and the same was not considered by the trial judge, however, in paras 6 and 7, the trial judge had elaborately discussed about the nature of offence as well as conduct of parties. Furthermore, considering the fact that the prosecution also raised objections stating that only to evade the procedures, they are not cooperating with the proceedings and one after another, they came forward with the said petition. The accused is also empowered to examine the witnesses, if it is relevant to the facts, but on seeing the request made by the petitioner, he wanted to issue summons to Bank Managers to examine them as defense side witnesses in order to produce the bank statements and also contended that the respondent police has not verified those statements during the investigation. Furthermore, the charge sheet was filed in the year 2013, the complaint was taken on file in C.C.No.19 of 2013, nearly about 13 years, the case is pending before the trial court, but all these years, the accused has not taken any steps nor raised any objections with regard to bank statements. It is not relevant to the facts of the case for the reason that nearly about 3200 depositors were cheated and more than a sum of Rs.66 crores is involved. Therefore, the statements of the bank is no way relevant to the facts of the case and the Investigation Officer has also properly verified all the materials. Hence, the issuance of summonses to the Bank Managers to examine them as defense side witnesses is unwarranted and it does not require interference. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed as no merit and the findings rendered by the trial court is confirmed. The petitioner is directed to cooperate with the trial proceedings, since because the case is pending nearly about 12 years and all these years, the innocent depositors are standing before this court without any course of action. Consequently, the connected Criminal Miscellaneous Petition is closed.



17-11-2025

Index: Yes/No

Speaking/Non-speaking order

Internet: Yes

Neutral Citation: Yes/No

rpp

To

1. Special Judge, Special Court under TNPID Act, Coimbatore.
2. The Superintendent of Police, Tiruppur EOW II.
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 2372 of 2025



T.V.THAMILSELVI J.

rpp

**CRL RC No. 2372 of
2025
AND CRL MP NO.
21458 OF 2025**

17-11-2025