

IN THE COURT OF THE PRINCIPAL DISTRICT AND SESSIONS JUDGE AT TIRUVALLUR

Present: Dr. J. JULIET PUSHPA, Ph.D. (Law)

Principal District and Sessions Judge, Tiruvallur

Thursday, the 30th day of July, 2026

Crl.M.P.No:2785/2026

(CNR No. TNTR010059022026)

Mohath, S/o Jamil Masthan

...Petitioner/Accused

//Versus//

State Rep. by the Inspector of Police,
CCD, Cyber Crime, Avadi Police station
(Crime No: 8/2026)

.....Respondent/Complainant

Petition dated: 09.07.2026 u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner

This petition coming on this day for hearing before me having the petition filed by the petitioners Counsel M/s S. Tamil Selvan, A. Manikandan, M. Lokesh, M. Mohan, R. Magesh, , and the State/respondent police represented by Thiru.N.R. Sreedharan Babu, the Public Prosecutor, and upon hearing the arguments of both sides, perusing the reply of the Public Prosecutor for the State/Respondent and perusing the records and material and hearing both sides, this court made the following:-

ORDER

Heard arguments of both side. Records perused. Petition filed u/s 482 of BNSS praying to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner who apprehends arrest in Crime No.8/2026 of CCD (Cyber Crime), Avadi Police station for the offence u/s 318(4) of BNS r/w 66D of IT Act.

The learned counsel for the petitioner argued that, the petitioner is innocent he has not committed any offence, petitioner's brother is running an office Royal Feel Technician Private Limited wherein the petitioner is also employed , about 4 months ago, one MOnesh introduced to the petitioner representing himself as employee of Kotak Mahindra Bank, thereafter, the said Monesh developed acquaintance with petitioner and represented that he could arrange loan for prospective customers , relying upon the said representation, he acted in good faith, two months ago, the said Monesh was arrested by Cyber Crime police, subsequently he was released, the petitioner received notice from the police, in connection with this case, accordingly, he could not appear on 19.06.2026, due to illhealth, there is no overtact as against the petitioner, even a single pie was flown into the account of the petitioner, he is innocent, all the allegations are against A1, who was already arrested and granted bail, petitioner has no bad antecedents, he is ready to cooperate for investigation and will abide by any condition, therefore prayed for granting the anticipatory bail.

Notice given to concerned police and reply received. The learned Public prosecutor argued that defacto complainant lodged a complaint stating that on 28.01.2026, he received a whatsapp message from 9384108663 with a link <http://playgoogle.com/> app with online trading , he was contacted and joined in the link by some persons, and represented to some unknown persons inducted him to invest online trading, believing their words, from 29.01.2026 to 09.04.2026, he invested totally Rs.59,04,516/- , and further they represented and demanded Rs.5,00,000/- to withdraw the invest and profit, suspecting their demand, on verification found that they cheated the defacto complainant and deceived Rs.59,04,516/- , based on the FIR was registered, A1 and A2 were arrested on 30.04.2026, notice issued to petitioner but he did not appear and cooperate for investigation and investigation is pending, no amount was recovered,

The petitioner states in this petition that there is no similar bail petition is pending before any other Court including Hon'ble High Court, Madras and the respondent has also not stated as to pending of any bail petition before Hon'ble High Court, Madras in this case. Hence, this Court considers that there is no impediment to entertain this petition and pass orders on merits.

As per the reply of the learned Public Prosecutor, investigation is still pending and the amount is not recovered.

Therefore, on considering

- (i) grave nature of offence
- (ii) investigation is still pending
- (iii) serious accusation of offence as against the petitioner u/s 318(4) of BNS
- (iv) huge value of the amount allegedly involved, which is not yet recovered
- (v) the petitioner who seeks anticipatory bail cannot claim parity with the arrested and released accused
- (v) and also considering other facts and circumstances,

this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

In the result, this petition is dismissed.

Dictated to the Shorthand Writer and Pronounced by me in Open Court on this 30th day of July, 2026

**Principal District and Sessions Judge,
Tiruvallur**

Copy to

The Petitioner's Advocate M/s S. Tamil Selvan
Thiru.N.R. Sreedharan Babu, Public Prosecutor for the State
The Judicial Magistrate No.II, Tiruvallur
The Inspector of police, CCD (Cyber Crime) Avadi police Station