



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.11.2025

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.30867 of 2025

Parvathi Parthiban

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State, represented by
The Inspector of Police,
T 16 Nazharatpettai Police Station,
Chennai District.
(Crime No.315 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.315
of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.B.Kumar,
Senior Advocate,
for Mr.M.GowthamRaj.

For Intervenor : Mr.R.Shunmugasundaram,
Senior Advocate,
for Mr.G.Mohana Krishnan.

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



ORDER

WEB COPY

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 351(2) of BNS in Crime No.315 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, who is known to the defacto complainant for the past four years, volunteered to help the defacto complainant to purchase dresses and other marriage items for the defacto complainant's daughter and collected a sum of Rs.14,82,203/-. It is alleged further alleged that after purchasing certain items, the petitioner failed to handover the goods and refused to return the amount, and thereafter threatened the defacto complainant. Hence the case.

3. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a textile designer and permanently residing at Bangalore. The defacto complainant was introduced to her through his daughter Bhavana



Reddy. In August 2025, the defacto complainant contacted the petitioner stating that he was interested in the business handled by the petitioner and had some clients in Singapore who could give bulk orders. He then requested the petitioner to accompany him to Singapore. It is further alleged that on 20.08.2025, the defacto complainant invited the petitioner to his house and only thereafter she understood his real intention to molest her. When she resisted, he misbehaved, assaulted her, caused injuries on her cheek and forcibly took her diamond bracelet worth Rs.1.25 crores. It is further alleged that he threatened her to co-operate with him, failing which he would assault her physically, hence a separate complaint was also registered against the defacto complainant. He further submitted that alleged offence was taken place at Bangalore and it is strange that the respondent registered the FIR at Chennai. Hence, he prayed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned counsel for the Intervenor submitted so far no amount



is recovered, and the petitioner cheated the defacto complainant to the tune of Rs.32,82,203/- and when he asked for refund of money, the petitioner threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) would submit that the petitioner has been known to the defacto complainant for more than four years. It is submitted that the defacto complainant is residing at Chennai and money was paid through bank account at Chennai, hence they came forward to register the FIR and investigation is in progress. Apart from the present case, another case has also been registered against the petitioner for receiving a sum of Rs.1,00,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and cheating him. Investigation is further revealed from the FIR that a sum of Rs.14,00,000/- has been paid for the purchase of articles, but only a few items were returned by the petitioner and the remaining articles were allegedly transferred in favour of A2. It is also alleged that no amount has



been recovered so far. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and that huge amounts were cheated by receiving money from the defacto complainant and so far no money is recovered and that investigation is still pending and if the anticipatory bail is granted it would hamper the investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

21.11.2025

kmm



WEB COPY

1. The Inspector of Police,
T 16 Nazharatpettai Police Station,
Chennai District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR.J.,

kmm

Crl.O.P.No.30867 of 2025



WEB COPY



21.11.2025