



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.9582 of 2026

IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 17.04.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE Mr. JUSTICE C.KUMARAPPAN

Crl.O.P.No.9582 of 2026

Saravanan

... Petitioner

Vs.

State represented by
The Inspector of Police,
HQRS, EOW, Chennai – 600 053.
Crime No.02 of 2025.

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita, Act, 2023, to enlarge the petitioner on bail in the event of his arrest by the respondent police in the above Cr.No.02 of 2025 on the file of the respondent.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sathish Rajan
For Respondent : Mr.P.Dhileepan
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

ORDER

The petitioner apprehends arrest for the alleged offence under Sections 409, 420, 34 of IPC/ 316(5), 318(4) & 3(5) of BNS and Sections 21(1), 21(2) & 21(3) of Banning of Unregulated Deposit Schemes Act, 2019, in Crime No.02 of 2025 on the file of the respondent police seeks anticipatory bail.



Crl.O.P.No.9582 of 2026

2. The allegation against the petitioner is that the petitioner colluded with other accused induced 26 victims including the defacto complainant to invest in the M/s. Lakshmi Classic Homes Private Limited and thereby cheated to the tune of Rs.3,71,40,146/-. Hence, the case.

3. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner is ready to abide by any stringent condition that may be imposed by this Court. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the respondent police reiterated the prosecution case and submitted that the petitioner failed to return the money or pay the principal along with interest. He further submitted that unless the petitioner is taken into custody, the question of unearthing the layer of money could not be identified. He further submit that the petitioner alone cheated the victim to the tune of Rs.1,3,45,000/-. Hence, he vehemently opposed for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.



Crl.O.P.No.9582 of 2026

5. From the submissions made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) and the magnitude of the money involved in this case, this Court is of the firm view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is very much required in this case. Hence, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

17.04.2026

sma

To

1. The Inspector of Police,
HQRS, EOW, Chennai – 600 053.
2. The Public Prosecutor,
High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



Crl.O.P.No.9582 of 2026

C.KUMARAPPAN.J.

sma

Crl.O.P.No.9582 of 2026

17.04.2026