



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.8120 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 01.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.8120 of 2026

Rajeshkumar

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Represented by
The Inspector of Police,
CCD-I, Chennai City.
Crime No.45 of 2025

... Respondent

PRAYER: Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of Bharatiya
Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, 2023, praying to enlarge the petitioner's
anticipatory bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.45 of 2025 pending
investigation on the file of the respondent police.

For Petitioner : Mr.R.Rajesh

For Respondent : Mr.P.Dhileepan,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent
police for the offences punishable under Sections 316(2), 318(4), 319(2),

336(3), 338 of BNS r/w Section 66D of Information Technology Act, in
1/4



Crl.O.P.No.8120 of 2026

Crime No.45 of 2025, on the file of the respondent Police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner, along with A1, who is the brother of the petitioner, was involved in an online trading scam. The petitioner and others sent an online application and induced the de facto complainant to invest money into bank accounts furnished by them. Further, A5 directed A1 to arrange bank accounts. Accordingly, A1, with the help of A3, opened bank accounts and the same were handed over to A1. After the money was deposited, on the instructions of A5, A1 transferred the money to other mule accounts and, so far, no amount has been recovered. It is further reported that in respect of the said bank accounts, 26 complaints have already been registered. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has not at all been involved in the offence and, even according to the prosecution case, no amount was transferred to the petitioner's account. The learned counsel would further submit that no money has been credited to the petitioner's account.



Crl.O.P.No.8120 of 2026

4. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police would submit that the bank accounts were opened at the instance of the petitioner and, through such accounts, the amounts were transferred to various suspicious accounts, and that the petitioner had received commission. He would further submit that, as against the petitioner, about 26 NCRP complaints in respect of online fraud are pending.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would also submit that this Court had already dismissed the petitioner's anticipatory bail applications in Crl.O.P.Nos.28400 of 2025 and 2031 of 2026 dated 17.10.2025 and 30.01.2026 respectively.

6. Taking into consideration of the above aspects, including the earlier dismissal of anticipatory bail petitions, the contention of the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) that custodial interrogation is essential cannot be found fault with, and this Court does not find any merits in the petition.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition stands dismissed.

01.04.2026

cda

3/4



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.8120 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN, J.

cda

To

- 1.The Inspector of Police,
CCD-I, Chennai City.
- 2.The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.

Crl.O.P.No.8120 of 2026

01.04.2026