



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.519 of 2025

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 21.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.519 of 2026

Sitharth @ Sitharthan

... Petitioner

Vs.

The State of Tamilnadu rep by
The Inspector of Police,
CBCID-Krishnagiri Police Station,
CBCID-North, Krishnagiri District.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, to enlarge the petitioner/accused No.6 on bail, in
the event of his arrestor surrender in connection with the Crime No.2 of
2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Shankar Ganesh

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under
Sections 120B, 465, 468, 471, 420 of IPC, 1860 r/w Sections 3 and 5 of
Emblems and Name (Prevention of Improper Use) Act, 1950 in Cr.No.2 of
2025 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner is a member of a gang which falsely claimed that they were in possession of a huge money from foreign accounts and that, for the purpose of releasing the said amount, approval from the Reserve Bank of India was required. It is further alleged that, under the guise of obtaining such approval, the accused sought financial assistance and induced several persons to pay a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- each, promising to repay Rs.1,00,00,000/-. Accordingly, a total sum of Rs.1.77 crores was collected. Subsequently, it was revealed that the persons who had received money from the victims were pastors, who later came forward to lodge complaints, pursuant to which the present case was registered.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is arrayed as A6 in the present case and that there are no specific allegations against him. It was contended that the entire allegations in the FIR are only against the other accused. It was further submitted that the other accused had induced the defacto complainant and other victims to part with money and that no amount was received by the petitioner. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioner was arrested in connection with another case and was released on bail after 20 days, and that the respondent police have not chosen to arrest the petitioner in the present case. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions that may be imposed



by this Court and therefore prayed for grant of anticipatory bail.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side), appearing for the respondent police, reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that there are totally six accused in the present case and that the petitioner is arrayed as A6. It was submitted that A1 to A5 collected a sum of Rs.1.77 crores from 18 victims under the pretext of providing huge profits if they invested in the scheme. After registration of the FIR, A1 and A3 were arrested, and during investigation it was revealed that A3 had paid a sum of Rs.5,00,000/- to the petitioner and A1 had paid a sum of Rs.2 crores. It was further revealed that the petitioner is involved in several other cases. It was also alleged that the petitioner had claimed that he was likely to receive Rs.6,000 crores from foreign countries and, for that purpose, sought assistance and collected money from the victims as well as from A1 and A2. Hence, the learned Government Advocate vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

5. Heard both sides and perused the materials available on record.

6. Considering the submissions made on both sides and upon perusal of the records, it is revealed that the petitioner has collected huge amounts under the pretext of repaying exorbitant profits to various persons, including A1 and A3, and that no amount has been recovered so far in the present case.



Crl.OP.No.519 of 2025

In view of the same, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

WEB COPY

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

21.01.2026

Vv

To

1. The Judicial Magistrate-I, Krishnagiri
2. The The Inspector of Police,
CBCID-Krishnagiri Police Station,
CBCID-North, Krishnagiri District.
3. The Public Prosecutor
High Court of Madras, Chennai 600 104.

K.RAJASEKAR, J.



WEB COPY



Crl.OP.No.519 of 2026

Vv

Crl.O.P.No.519 of 2026

21.01.2026