



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 30.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE K.RAJASEKAR

CRL.O.P.No.2080 of 2026

Murali Krishnan

... Petitioner

Versus

The State rep by its,
The Inspector of Police,
Puduchatram Police Station,
Cuddalore District.
(Crime No.90 of 2025)

.. Respondent

Prayer:- Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of B.N.S.S., to enlarge the petitioner on anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.90 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.T.Muruganantham

For Respondent : M/s.J.R.Archana
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest by the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 471, 464, 465 and 468 of IPC, in Crime No.90 of 2025 registered on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



2. The allegation against the petitioner is that he, along with the other accused, collected a sum of Rs.29 lakhs from the defacto complainant and two others on the promise of arranging employment. Subsequently, they failed to fulfil the said promise and thereby cheated the victims. Hence, the present case has been registered against the petitioner.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that there are three accused in this case and that A2 and A3 have already been granted bail. He further submitted that the petitioner had collected only a sum of Rs.6 lakhs. Hence, he prayed for the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the co-accused were granted bail by this Court only because they had not directly collected any money from the defacto complainant and the victims, and that they are merely family members of A1. He further submitted that A1 is the main accused and that the investigation is still pending. Hence, he opposed the grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Criminal Side) appearing for the respondent police and perused the materials available on record.



6. On perusal of the FIR and other connected materials, it is revealed that the defacto complainant has furnished details regarding various instances of payment and that the petitioner is alleged to have collected a sum of Rs.29 lakhs from the victims. Considering the seriousness of the allegations, the specific role attributed to the petitioner as the main accused, and the fact that the investigation is still pending, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

30.01.2026

drl

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
Puduchatram Police Station,
Cuddalore District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

drl

CRL.O.P.No.2080 of 2026

30.01.2026