



-1-

Crl.M.P.No.129 of 2026

IN THE COURT OF THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KARAIKUDI

PRESENT: THIRU. J.KARMEGAKANNAN, B.A., B.L.,

JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, KARAIKUDI

Wednesday, the 18th day of March 2026

Crl.MP.No.129 of 2026

Cr.No.223 of 2024

(On the File of the Karaikudi North PS)

CNR No.TNSV19 – 000 – 246 – 2026

Lakshmanan,

S/o.Ganesan,

No.62A,

Mylapore Village,

Ponnamaravathi Taluk,

Pudhukottai District.

... Petitioner

Vs

The Inspector of Police,

Karaikudi North PS,

Crime.No.223/2024

... Respondent

1.Karthik,

S/o.Dharmadurai,

2.Adakappan,

S/o.Kaliyappan

... Accused

On today, this petition coming for final hearing before me on 18.03.2026 in the presence of Advocate Thiru.S.Bharathiraja for the Petitioner and being defended by the Learned Assistant Public Prosecutor.



Upon perusing the records and having stood over for consideration, this court delivers the following

ORDER

1.The present petition has been filed under Sections 503 and 497 of the Bharatiya Nagarik Suraksha Sanhita seeking interim custody of a sum of Rs.4,31,000/- in favour of the petitioner.

2. The petitioner has submitted that he lodged a complaint against one Karthik and based on the said complaint, an FIR in Crime No.223 of 2024 has been registered on the file of the respondent police. According to the petitioner, at the request of the said Karthik, who is the accused in the above crime, he had paid a sum of Rs.2,41,000/- through PhonePe and another sum of Rs.1,90,000/- through his bank account, thereby totally paying a sum of Rs.4,31,000/-. It is his further contention that the said amount has been recovered from the accused and the same is presently under the custody of the respondent police and therefore he seeks interim custody of the said amount.

3. Per contra, the respondent police have filed their reply stating that based on the complaint lodged by the petitioner on 28.05.2024, it was alleged that the accused persons were running an institution in the name of LK Skill Institute and promising to send persons abroad for employment and thereby collected huge sums of money from various persons. It is further stated that the petitioner himself had alleged in the complaint that he had paid a sum of



Rs.3,80,000/- to the accused persons. On enquiry, it was revealed that the accused persons had cheated several persons and collected nearly Rs.50,71,000/- from different victims and also obtained several passports from them.

4. It is further submitted by the respondent police that the accused persons were arrested on 25.07.2024 and during the course of investigation, a sum of Rs.2,50,000/- and 25 passports were recovered from them. The accused also gave a statement that the said amount represents the money collected from various customers and that the remaining amount had already been spent by them. The respondent police further stated that the seized amount is presently under their custody and the same will be deposited before the Court. They have also furnished a list of victims along with the amounts allegedly collected from them as follows;-

| SI.No. | Name of the victims | Transaction Through the Bank | Transaction in Cash | Total |
|--------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Lakshmanan (23/24) | 1,90,000/- | 1,90,000/- | 3,80,8000/- |
| 2 | Velankanni | 2,50,000/- | 70,000/- | 3,20,000/- |
| 3 | Karuppaiah (24/24) | 60,000/- | 1,40,000/- | 2,00,000/- |
| 4 | Manoj (22/24) | 1,50,000/- | 70,000/- | 2,20,000/- |



| | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|------------|------------|------------|
| 5 | Ramanarayanan (34/24) | 1,50,000/- | - | 1,50,000/- |
| 6 | Subramanian (37/24) | | 2,25,000/- | 2,25,000/- |
| 7 | Sundarraaj (30/24) | | 2,25,000/- | 2,25,000/- |
| 8 | Gandhi (58/24) | 1,25,000/- | 2,25,000/- | 3,50,000/- |
| 9 | Mohanraj (44/24) | | 2,00,000/- | 2,00,000/- |
| 10 | Rajasekar (23/24) | 1,00,000/- | 10,000/- | 1,10,000/- |
| 11 | Arunpandian (24) | 1,00,000/- | | |
| 12 | Mariyammal (48/24) | 1,00,000/- | 2,08,000/- | 3,08,000/- |
| 13 | Rajasekaran (55/24) | | 20,000/- | 20,000/- |
| 14 | Sindhuja(25/24) | 60,000/- | 40,000/- | 1,00,000/- |
| 15 | Rajdurai (28/24) | 30,000/- | 20,000/- | 50,000/- |
| 16 | Vetrivel (48/24) | | 60,000/- | 60,000/- |
| 17 | Akash (23/24) | 1,00,000/- | 6,000/- | 1,06,000/- |
| 18 | Santhosh (23/24) | 1,00,000/- | | 1,00,000/- |
| 19 | Arjunan (23/24) | 40,000/- | 1,95,000/- | 2,35,000/- |
| 20 | Nadimuthu (23/24) | | 20,000/- | 20,000/- |



| | | | | |
|----|---------------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 21 | Kamalahaasan (38/24) | 47,000/- | 3,70,000/- | 4,17,000/- |
| 22 | Vallavy (47/24) | 30,000/- | 1,00,000/- | 1,30,000/- |
| 23 | Jesuraja (47/24) | | 1,40,000/- | 1,40,000/- |
| 24 | Chandramurugan (28/24) | | 3,00,000/- | 3,00,000/- |
| 25 | Stephen Bergmans | | 1,00,000/- | 1,00,000/- |
| 26 | Dineshraj (31) | 45,000/- | 55,000/- | 1,00,000/- |
| 27 | Krishnaveni (43/24) | 91,000/- | 1,09,000/- | 2,00,000/- |
| 28 | Kaviraj | | 1,80,000/- | 1,80,000/- |
| | | 17,68,000/- | 33,03,000/- | 50,71,000/- |

5. This court heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Assistant Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police and perused the entire materials available on record.

6. Admittedly, the petitioner is the complainant in the present case and based on his complaint only the criminal law was set in motion and the FIR in Crime No.223 of 2024 came to be registered and the recovery was subsequently made from the accused persons. However, the petitioner claims that he had paid a total sum of Rs.4,31,000/- to the accused persons.



7. On the other hand, the respondent police have specifically contended that the petitioner had paid only a sum of Rs.1,90,000/- as hand cash and a further sum of Rs.1,90,000/- through bank transaction, thereby totaling only Rs.3,80,000/-. Thus, the amount alleged to have been paid by the petitioner himself is in dispute. When such dispute exists regarding the quantum of amount paid, the petitioner ought to have produced convincing and acceptable materials before this Court to substantiate his claim that he had paid a sum of Rs.4,31,000/- to the accused persons.

8. Moreover, on a perusal of the complaint lodged by the petitioner, it is revealed that he himself has stated therein that he had paid only a sum of Rs.3,80,000/- to the accused persons. Therefore, the claim now made by the petitioner that he had paid Rs.4,31,000/- is not supported by the materials available on record.

9. Further, the materials placed before this court reveal that nearly 28 persons have been identified as victims in this case and the accused persons are alleged to have cheated them by collecting substantial amounts. In such circumstances, when multiple victims are involved and the investigation is still in progress, the petitioner ought to have approached this court with clear and sufficient materials to establish his exclusive entitlement to the amount claimed by him.



-7-

Crl.M.P.No.129 of 2026

10. Hence, in the absence of such satisfactory proof and in view of the dispute regarding the amount allegedly paid by the petitioner, this court is of the considered view that the petitioner has failed to demonstrate his entitlement for interim custody of the amount as prayed for.

11. In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Typed by me in my computer, verified by me to be correct and pronounced in open court on 18th day of March, 2026.

Judicial Magistrate,
Karaikudi.