

**IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND
SESSIONS JUDGE, CHENGALPATTU**

Present : Thiru.T.Chandrasekaran, M.L.,
Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

Date: Tuesday, the 17th day of March 2026

Crl.M.P. No.650 of 2026
(CNR No. TNCG01-001474-2026)

M.Saranya, D/o. Late. Mohan,
No.2/76, Shanmugam Nagar,
1st Street, Mannivakkam,
Chennai - 600 048.

.. Petitioner/accused

//Versus//

State of Tamilnadu,
Rep. by Inspector of Police,
Tambaram Police Station
Cr. No.24 of 2026
U/s.316(2), 318(2) of BNS, 2023.

.. Respondent/Complainant

// and //

Priya, D/o.Settu,

.. Intervenor/defacto complainant
in CMP No.818 of 2025

This petition for anticipatory bail coming on this day for hearing before me, M/s.M.Prithivirajan, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused, M/s.R.Thirumurugan, the learned Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent/complainant and of M/s.D.Alexis Sudhakar, the learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant, upon hearing both sides and upon perusal of case records, this Court made the following:

O R D E R

The petition in Crl.M.P. No.650 of 2026 is filed by the petitioner/accused U/s.482 of B.N.S.S. to enlarge her on anticipatory bail, whereas the petition in Crl.M.P. No.818 of 2025 is filed by the defacto complainant/intervenor in order to object to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

2. The petitioner/accused apprehends arrest at the hands of respondent police for the alleged offences U/s.316(2), 318(2) of BNS, 2023 in connection with the Cr. No.24 of 2026 of respondent Police Station.

3. Notice given to the Public Prosecutor for the State and the reply submitted. Heard both sides. Records perused.

4. The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is the IT professional. During the year 2016, she got acquaintance with the petitioner as a colleague, while she was working at Navitas Life Science. Later they became close friends and the accused introduced one Rajesh that he was running a civil construction company and he needed financial investment to develop his company. Further the petitioner along with the said Rajesh induced and lured the defacto complainant that they would give 30% profit, if she invested money in their business, thereby persuaded her to invest money to the tune of Rs.82,00,000/- on various occasions. Initially, though the accused repaid a portion of amount as profit, later they stopped in paying the profit amount as assured and deliberately evaded her thereby cheated her. Thereby, a case has been registered in Cr. No.24 of 2026 on the file of respondent police station.

5. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner/accused would submit that the petitioner/accused has been falsely implicated in this case; the petitioner/accused was agreed to re-pay the profit of 10% to the defacto complainant accordingly the petitioner repaid a sum of Rs.2,89,000/- per month for some time; however, since the defacto complainant demanded a huge profit of 30% dispute arose between them; in fact for the received amount of Rs.82 Lakhs from the defacto complainant, the petitioner had repaid more than Rs.1.30 crores to her; while the facts are being a civil nature between the parties, the complainant tried to gave a criminal colour

and tried to put the petitioner into bar; the petitioner had attended the enquiry, where she was compelled by the police officials to sign promissory note and cheques and issue the same to the complainant thereby settle the issue; moreover, the petitioner is ready to abide by any conditions to be imposed upon her and she is ready to offer substantial sureties before the court, thereby prays for the dismissal of the petition.

6. The learned Public Prosecutor, on the other hand, re-iterated the prosecution case. He would further submitted that the investigation is not yet completed and objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. The learned counsel who is appearing for the defacto complainant/ intervenor would submit that the petitioner and the other accused one Rajesh have persuaded the defacto complainant to invest money in their business assuring to repay 30% of profit. Initially, the accused have returned a token amount of Rs.2,89,000/- representing it as 10% profit. But thereafter, with an dishonest intention to cheat the defacto complainant, they claimed that 30% profit would be paid only if she invested a total of Rs.45,00,000/-. Believing their words, she availed personal loan of Rs.17,00,000/- and invested the same in their business. However, when she demanded the promised returns, the accused and the said Rajesh abruptly stopped all payments and began avoiding her and also gave evasive, contradictory and irreconcilable reply thereby deliberately cheated her.

8. The learned counsel for the intervenor/defacto complainant further submitted that, after registering the case, the petitioner/accused has approached the Hon'ble High Court, Madras for anticipatory bail in Crl.O.P. No.4220 of 2026, subsequently she not-pressed the said petition. Though the Hon'ble High Court, Madras allowed the petitioner/accused to not-press her anticipatory bail petition, no liberty was granted to her by the Hon'ble

High Court, Madras to file anticipatory bail application afresh. Moreover, the petitioner evaded the enquiry before the Investigating Officer and the other accused Rajesh is yet to be arrested; hence custodial interrogation of the present petitioner is just and necessary to find out the truth. At this juncture, if the petitioner is enlarged on anticipatory bail, she will tamper the witnesses and evidences and objected to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and praying for the dismissal of the petition.

9. From the perusal of records and from the both sides submissions, it is seen, out of the disputed amount of Rs.82,00,000/-, a sum of Rs.8,77,000/- has been paid by cash and the remaining major portion of amount has been paid through bank transactions and the dispute appears to be the difference of assured profits. Though the learned counsel for the intervenor claimed that the petitioner/accused evaded the enquiry, it is submitted and admitted by the learned Public Prosecutor that summons were issued to the petitioner and she attended the enquiry twice before the investigating officer. Since the transactions are through bank accounts, there is no possibility of tampering the witnesses and evidences. Taking into consideration the nature of allegations levelled against the petitioner, remittance of Rs.1.30 Crores pleaded by the petitioner towards refund, the dispute seemed to be of civil in nature, already the petitioner appears to have attended the enquiry before the investigating officer, since the transactions are through bank, there is no possibility of tampering the witnesses and evidences and also considering the facts and circumstances of the case, this court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

10. In the result, Crl.M.P. No.650 of 2026 is allowed; anticipatory bail granted to the petitioner/accused with the following conditions. The intervenor petition in Crl.M.P. No.818 of 2026 is closed.

1. The petitioner, in the event of arrest or her surrender before the Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram within 15 days, is ordered to be released on bail on her execution of bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- with two sureties for a like sum, to the satisfaction of the same Magistrate;
2. The sureties shall affix their photographs and Left Thumb impression (LTI) in the surety bond and the sureties shall produce copy of any identify proof before the learned Magistrate to ensure their identity;
3. The petitioner is directed to report before the respondent station daily at 10.30 A.M. for 15 days;
4. The petitioner shall not tamper with the witnesses or hamper the investigation in any manner;
5. The petitioner should comply with the conditions contemplated u/s 482 (2)(i), (ii) and (iii) of B.N.S.S.;
6. If there is any breach of conditions, the Investigation Officer shall report to the learned Magistrate and the learned Magistrate shall take appropriate action as if the conditions have been imposed by the Magistrate himself/herself in accordance with the decision ***AIR 2006 S.C. 100 – P.K. Shaji vs State of Kerala.***

Pronounced by me in open court, on this the 17th day of March 2026.

Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Chengalpattu.

To
The Judicial Magistrate No.I, Tambaram.
The Inspector of Police, Tambaram Police Station