WEB COPY

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 04.12.2025

CORAM :
THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.33171 of 2025

Puneeth Kumar Jain ... Petitioner

Vs.

The State rep by
The Inspector of Police,
EDF I, Central Crime Branch
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054.
(Crime No.112 of 2025) … Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS Act, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner on Bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.112 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.G.Viswanathan
For Intervenor : .Mohanakrishnan
For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

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, 2023 in Crime No. 112 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner herein is ranked as A3. The de-facto complainant had approached the petitioner and others to purchase some diamonds for his daughter's marriage and accordingly, he has also paid a sum of Rs.1,05,00,000/- for the supply of diamonds, and after receiving the money, they have failed to return back the money. Since A1 and A2 introduced the petitioner herein, they also been added as an accused in this case. Hence the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner has handed over the diamonds as per the instructions of the de-facto complainant to the first accused in this case. He further submitted that A1 and the de-facto complainant are close relatives and the said payments were paid through bank account. After receiving money, the diamonds were supplied to the first accused as per the instructions of de-facto complainant and the petitioner is also ready to co-operate with the investigation. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

4.Mr.G.Mohanakrishnan, learned Counsel for the Intervener submitted that after receipt of money from the de-facto complainant, the petitioner and other co-accused have not supplied the diamonds and without supplying the same, the petitioner colluded with A1 and A2 and misappropriated the funds. Hence he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the FIR has recently registered and no one was arrested in this case, and the properties yet to be recovered. He opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner herein collected a sum of Rs.1,05,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant and thereafter, failed to supply the diamonds, and now, it is further reported that A1 to A3 have colluded and misappropriated a sum of Rs.1,05,00,000/- belonging to the de-facto complainant, and there is no material produced before this Court to substantiate the submission of petitioner, this Court is unable to accept the reasons advanced by the petitioner herein, and so far no money or diamond is recorded and A1 and A2 still absconding, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

04.12.2025

MSM

To

1. The Inspector Of Police, EDF I, Central Crime Branch
Avadi, Chennai – 600 054.
2.The Public Prosecutor, High Court of Madras.

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis

WEB COPY

K.RAJASEKAR, J.

MSM

CRL OP No. 33171 of 2025

04.12.2025

https://www.mhc.tn.gov.in/judis