



WEB COPY



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED: 11-03-2026

CORAM

THE HON'BLE MR.JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.R.C.No.607 of 2026

Navaneetha Krishnan Bagavathi

..Petitioner(s)

Vs

State rep by The Inspector of Police,
Central Crime Branch,
Job Racketing Wing,
Alpha-7, Vepery, Egmore,
Chennai – 600 008.

..Respondent(s)

PRAYER: Criminal Revision Case filed under Section 438 r/w 442 of BNSS, 2023, to set aside the order passed by the learned Additional CCB & CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate at Egmore, Chennai – 600 008 in Crl.M.P.No.617 of 2026 dated 23.02.2026 and to direct the respondent to return back Rs.14,98,500/- (Rupees Fourteen Lakhs Ninety Eight Thousand and Five Hundred only) seized in Crime No.242 of 2026 to the petitioner.

For Petitioner(s):

Mr.S.Mohan Raj

For Respondent(s):

Mr.R.Kishore Kumar
Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

ORDER

This Criminal Revision Case has been filed to set aside the order passed by the learned Additional CCB & CBCID Metropolitan Magistrate at Egmore, Chennai, in Crl.M.P.No.617 of 2026 dated 23.02.2026 and to direct the



respondent to return back Rs.14,98,500/- (Rupees Fourteen Lakhs Ninety Eight Thousand and Five Hundred only) seized in Crime No.242 of 2026 to the petitioner.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner, along with the other accused, in the guise of obtaining Government job for the defacto complainant's son in Agricultural Department, demanded Rs.13,00,000/- and received Rs.6,00,000/-; that thereafter, the accused issued a fake appointment order through email and on coming to know that the said appointment order was fake, the defacto complainant approached the accused and demanded return of money. Despite repeated demands, the accused, neither obtained any job nor returned the money and thereby cheated the defacto complainant. On enquiry, the respondent found that the accused have cheated several other persons a sum of Rs.63,28,000/-. Hence, the case.

3.The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the amount, which has been recovered from the accused, was the amount paid by this petitioner to the accused. However, the learned Government Advocate would submit that according to the prosecution, the petitioner had paid the amount to the accused during 2021 and apart from that, the learned Government Advocate would further submit that investigation is still pending and that the accused had



given a note containing 76 pages, which refers the names of the persons, who have been cheated by him. The learned Magistrate has considered all these aspects and has found that before conclusion of the investigation, the ownership over the amount recovered cannot be determined. This Court absolutely does not find any infirmity in the order of the learned Magistrate. Hence, this Court is not inclined to set aside the order of the trial Court.

4. Accordingly, this Criminal Revision Case is dismissed. However, the petitioner is given liberty to move an application, after filing of the charge sheet. If any such application is filed, the learned Magistrate shall consider the same, in accordance with its own merit and not influenced by any observation made by this Court.

11.03.2026

ata

To

1. The Additional CCB and CBCID Metroplitan Magistrate at Egmore, Chennai.
2. The Inspector of Police, Central Crime Branch, Job Racketing Wing, Alpha-7, Vepery, Egmore, Chennai
3. The Public Prosecutor, High Court, Madras.



WEB COPY



C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

ata

Crl.R.C.No.607 of 2026

11.03.2026