



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 349 of 2



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 16-02-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE SUNDER MOHAN

**CRL RC No. 349 of 2026
& Crl.M.P.Nos.2587 & 2589 of 2026**

Raja
S/o. Perumal,
No.26/7, Ganapathipuram Main Road,
St.Thomas Mount,
Kanchipuram District.
Tamil Nadu - 600 016.

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch -I,
Ranipet.

..Respondent(s)

Prayer: This Criminal Revision Petition is filed under Section 438 r/w. 442 of BNSS, 2023, to set aside the order in Crl.M.P.No.378 of 2025 in CC.No.119 of 2025 made the order dated 02.12.2025 on the file of the learned Judicial Magistrate Court No.II at Walajapet.

For Petitioner(s): Mr.T.N.Rajeshwaran

For Respondent(s): Mr.R.Vinothraja
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

The Revision challenges the dismissal of the discharge petition filed by the petitioner, who is arrayed as A1 and facing prosecution for the offences under Section 120B, 417 and 420 IPC.



2.It is the case of the prosecution that the petitioner along with A2 had made false representation to the defacto complainant and other victims stating that they would obtain jobs in the Army as they were known to high officials in the Army and had received a total sum of Rs.59,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and other victims and thus committed the aforesaid offences. The petitioner filed a petition before the trial Court seeking discharge, which came to be dismissed by the impugned order.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that during the course of investigation, A2 had admitted his liability and had promised to repay the said amount of Rs.59,00,000/- to all the victims; that the petitioner has never met the defacto complainant or other victims and the prosecution case that all the victims met the petitioner during the concerned period is highly improbable and therefore, the petitioner is entitled to discharge.

4.Heard the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) and perused the materials available on record.

5.It is seen from the final report that the allegation is that both A1 and A2 had demanded the money from the defacto complainant and thus promised to obtain jobs in the Army. The statements of the witnesses also would reveal that



the petitioner also was involved in collection of money. Therefore, at this stage, the defence of the petitioner cannot be appreciated. Though the second accused may have admitted his liability to pay, the petitioner is charged for the offence of conspiracy. Therefore, this Court is not inclined to entertain this Revision.

6.Hence, the Revision is dismissed, with liberty to the petitioner to raise all his points before the trial Court. Consequently, the connected criminal miscellaneous petitions are closed.

16-02-2026

Index: Yes/No
Speaking/Non-speaking order
Neutral Citation: Yes/No

TSG

To

- 1.The Judicial Magistrate Court No.II at Walajapet.
- 2.The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch -I,
Ranipet.
- 3.The Public Prosecutor,
Madras High Court.



WEB COPY

CRL RC No. 349 of 2



SUNDER MOHAN, J.

TSG

**CRL RC No. 349 of 2026
& CrI.M.P.Nos.2587 & 2589 of 2026**

16-02-2026