



IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT MADRAS

DATED : 05.01.2026

CORAM

THE HONOURABLE MR JUSTICE **K.RAJASEKAR**

Crl.O.P.No.32475 of 2025

Rajinikanth @ Rajini

... Petitioner

Vs.

State Represented by;

The Inspector of Police,

Muthandikuppam Police Station, Cuddalore District.

(Crime No.174 of 2025)

... Respondent

PRAYER : Criminal Original Petition filed under Section 482 of BNSS, 2023, to enlarge the Petitioner/A20 on Anticipatory Bail in the event of his arrest in Crime No.174/2025 or on his appearance before the concern court on the file of the Respondent/Complainant.

For Petitioner : Mr.S.Sivakumar

For Respondent : Ms.J.R.Archana

Government Advocate (Crl. Side)



ORDER

The petitioner herein apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 303(2), 316(2), 316(5), 318(4), 338, 340(2), 61(2), 111(4) of BNS, 2023 and Section 43, 43A, 66C, 66D Information Technology Act, 2000 in Crime No.174 of 2025, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that while investigating a petition in CSR.No.944 of 2025 dated 11.09.2025, a statement was recorded from one Ashok Kumar, which revealed several facts relating to the misuse of bank accounts of various persons in connection with online trading. During the course of enquiry, about 20 individuals were found to be involved in an online scam by diverting funds from persons dealing with online trading without their knowledge. Based on the said materials, a separate complaint was registered and the investigation has proceeded. So far, A3 to A5 have been arrested. The investigation further revealed that all the petitioners were involved in transferring funds from one account to another for the purpose of siphoning off money from various investors, amounting to Rs.2.49 crores.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the respondent police have registered a suo motu complaint and so far no individual investor involved in online trading has come forward to lodge any complaint against the



accused persons. It is further submitted that the allegation that the petitioners accessed online trading accounts of dead persons and took away money, which was shared among themselves. However, the counsel argued that the allegation itself is not valid since the online trading was carried out by individuals, and if any money was swindled, they would have lodged a complaint immediately. Since no complaint has been lodged, it is a false complaint. Hence, he prays to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4 The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the respondent reported that the investigation in this case is pending and so far, they have identified 7 persons' accounts and recovered sum of Rs.49 lakhs. He further submitted that various bank accounts have been utilized for transferring funds from one Zerodha fake online trading account. Hence, he opposed to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

5. Heard the learned counsel on either side and perused the materials available on record.

6. It is seen that similarly placed accused had earlier filed anticipatory bail applications before this Court in Crl.O.P.Nos.28228 & 27818 of 2025 and the same were dismissed by order dated 03.11.2025. The anticipatory bail applications were dismissed on the following reasons:-



"8. Considering the fact that some of the amount has already been recovered from arrested accused and the case has been registered based on a suo moto complaint and though so far, no private individual has come forward with allegations that huge amounts have been swindled by the petitioners from the various accounts including dead persons accounts, I am of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioners is required in this matter. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners in CrI.O.P.No.28228 and 27818 of 2025."

7. The reasons stated for dismissing the earlier anticipatory bail applications would squarely apply to the present petitioner also. Considering the serious nature of the allegations and the materials collected during the course of investigation, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

8. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

05.01.2026

kmm



To

1. The Inspector of Police,

Muthandikuppam Police Station, Cuddalore District.

2. The Public Prosecutor,

High Court of Madras.



WEB COPY



K.RAJASEKAR, J.

kmm

Crl.O.P.No.32475 of 2025

05.01.2026