



**IN THE COURT OF XI METROPOLITAN MAGISTRATE/
XI JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, SAIDAPET, CHENNAI.**

Present: **Thiru.K.Ramkumar, M.L.,**
XI Metropolitan Magistrate/XI Judicial Magistrate(FAC), Saidapet.

Wednesday, the 12th day of August 2026

Crl.M.P.No.5014/2026
(CNR No.TNCH0C-011289-2026)
in
Crime No.36/2026

Murugan,
S/o.Govindhasamy,
No.1/111, Manju Nagar,
TPT C Nagar OPP,
Valudureddi,
Villupuram.

... Petitioners/Accused

-Vs-

State represented by
Deputy Superintendent of Police,
State Cyber Crime Investigation Centre,
Cyber Crime Wing,
Chennai.
Crime No.36/2026.

... Respondent/Complainant

This petition came up for hearing before me on 12.08.2026, Learned counsel Mr.E.Shanthakumar appeared for petitioners, Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor Grade-I appeared for respondent and upon hearing both side, pursuing the records, this Court passed the following :-

ORDER

This petition filed u/s.480 BNSS praying to enlarge the petitioner on bail against the offence U/s.318(4), 319(2), 61(2) BNS and sections 66D, 84(B) of IT Act.



2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case, he is no way connected with the alleged offence and that the petitioner is ready to co-operate with the investigation and also undertakes to co-operate with the investigation and further submitted that he is in judicial custody for the past 6 days, and ready to comply the condition imposed by this court without any deviation, hence prays to grant bail to the petitioner.

3. Per contra the learned APP stoutly opposed to grant bail to the petitioner/accused on the ground that if the petitioner/accused is released on bail there is every chance for tampering the witnesses, and he may involve in similar kind of offence, and there is every possibilities to abscond the accused, and it will affect the investigation. Hence, prays dismiss the petition.

4. The point for determination is whether the petitioner is entitle to bail or not?

5. Heard both sides. Perused records. The case of the prosecution is, in the online trading scam the defacto complainant Senthilkumar was induced and transferred amount of Rs.3.79 Crores to the scammers accounts, on the pretext of high returns. Upon realizing the fraud, the defacto complainant lodged the complaint. Following that FIR registered in Cr.No.36/2026 under sections 318(4), 319(2) BNS and sections 66D of IT Act. The investigation revealed that petitioner shared bank account details and registered mobile number and fraudulent amount of Rs.30,00,000/- was credited and the petitioner received 1% commission for transaction. Hence, petitioner was arrested on 07.08.2026 and remanded to judicial custody. At this juncture, on behalf of



accused Murugan, this bail application is filed.

6. Considering the grave nature of offence, the cheated amount yet to be recover, investigation is pending, co-accused are absconding, if the accused is released on bail there is every possibility to abscond and indulge in similar kind of offences, this Court is not inclined to grant bail to the petitioner.

In fine, for the above reasons this petition is dismissed.

Dictated by me to the Steno-typist and typed by her and corrected and pronounced by me in open Court on this the 12th day of August 2026.

XI Metropolitan Magistrate/
XI Judicial Magistrate(FAC),
Saidapet, Chennai.

Copy to:

The Superintendent
Central Prison, Puzhal,
Chennai-600 066.