



Crl.OP.No.30745 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 18.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.30745 of 2025

1. B.Damodaran
2. G.Janagi
3. D.Aakash
4. D.Abdul Salman

... Petitioners

Vs.

State Rep by
The Station House Officer,
CID Police Station, Puducherry.
(Crime No.17 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioners on anticipatory bail in the event of their arrest with Cr.No.17 of 2025 pending investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Vijay Kumar

For Respondent : Mr.M.V.Ramachandra Murthy
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 420 and 34 of IPC in Cr.No.17 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner had induced the defacto complainant to part with a sum of Rs.1.30 Crores on the pretext of investing the same and returning huge profits. Accordingly, the petitioner collected the amount. Later, it came to light that the petitioner was in the habit of cheating several persons and had misappropriated the said amount. Hence, the present complaint has been lodged.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner had already invested the money collected from the defacto complainant in various sources, including lands. In this regard, one of the landowners had also initiated a suit in O.S.No.1239 of 2024, in which a compromise was effected, and the petitioner was a party. Therefore, it is clear that the petitioner had invested the money and had not misappropriated the same. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent conditions that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. Per contra, the learned counsel appearing for the intervenor submitted that the petitioner is having bad antecedents and, suppressing various disputes pending against him, induced the defacto complainant to

2/5



part with money by promising huge returns. He further submitted that the petitioner had even offered to mortgage land which was already in dispute, and in this regard, a separate criminal case has been registered in Cr.No.131 of 2024 on the file of the Reddiarpatti Police Station. Hence, he strongly opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and, on instructions, submitted that the investigation is still pending and that the FIR was registered only recently. Hence, he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

6. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record, which reveal that it is an admitted fact that the petitioner had misappropriated a sum of Rs.1.30 Crores and that no amount has been repaid to the defacto complainant so far. It is also found that, in the meantime, the defacto complainant was dragged into civil litigation, and the petitioner had paid money to another opposite party to settle the issue.



Crl.OP.No.30745 of 2025

7. In view of the above facts and since admittedly no amount has been repaid and there is no material to show that the money is secured or recovered, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

18.11.2025

Vv

To

1. The Chief Judicial Magistrate,
Puducherry.
2. The Station House Officer,
CID Police Station, Puducherry.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras,
Chennai 600 104.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.30745 of 2025

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.30745 of 2025

18.11.2025