



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 12.01.2026

CORAM :

THE HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE K. RAJASEKAR

Crl.O.P.No.721 of 2026

Thangavel

... Petitioner

-Vs-

The State Represented by its
Inspector of Police,
Beta-IV, EDF-II,
CCB (Central Crime Branch) Police Station,
Veppary, Chennai District-07.
(Crime No.199 of 2025)

... Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 483 of BNSS Act, 2023,
pleaded to enlarge the petitioner on bail in Crime No.199 of 2025 pending on the
file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner	:	Mr.John Sathyan, Senior Advocate.
For Intervenor	:	Mr.P.Sathyanathan.
For Respondent	:	Mr.A.Gopinath, Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on
10.12.2025, for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 406, 409,420,
120(B) r/w 34 of IPC, in Crime No.199 of 2025, on the file of the respondent
police, seeks bail.

1/4



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner is arrayed as A2 in this case. Ravikumar/A1 in this case, along with others, entered into a sale agreement in respect of land belonging to one Siddharth Kalad, situated at Pudupakkam, and allegedly collected a total sum of Rs.8.20 crores as sale consideration. However, they have not come forward to execute the sale deed, allegedly on the pretext of discharging the original loan. Subsequently, the defacto complainant came to know that neither the petitioner nor A1/Ravi Kumar or their authorised persons had any right to deal with the property. It is alleged that the petitioner received a huge amount and cheated the defacto complainant. Hence, the case.

3. The learned Senior Counsel for the petitioner submitted that there was already an agreement between the parties and that they had agreed to convey some other portion of the land instead of the land in issue in favour of the defacto complainant. It was further submitted that the entire allegation in the FIR is only against A1/Ravi Kumar and not against the petitioner herein. Hence, he prays to grant bail to the petitioner.



4. The learned counsel appearing for the Intervenor submitted that the agreement relied upon by the learned Senior Counsel pertains to land belonging to the defacto complainant, situated at a different village, and that a complaint has already been lodged. It was further submitted that said agreement is irrelevant for the allegations in the present case. The petitioner herein has no manner of right to deal with the land belonging to Siddharth Kalad and so far, no amount has been recovered. Hence, he opposed to grant bail to the petitioner.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent submitted that out of the total amount of Rs.8.20 crores, only Rs.2.20 crores were paid through bank account. Since the investigation is still pending, he opposed to grant of bail to the petitioner.

6. Considering the fact that the petitioner herein, along with A1, collected a sum of Rs.8.20 crores and that only Rs.2.20 crores have been accounted for, including Rs.56,00,000/- paid through bank transactions, and no amount has been recovered so far and the investigation is still pending, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.



WEB COPY



K. RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

7. Hence, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

12.01.2026

kmm

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Beta-IV, EDF-II,
CCB (Central Crime Branch) Police Station,
Veppary, Chennai District-07.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.721 of 2026

12.01.2026