

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE K.ABRAHAM MATHEW

THURSDAY, THE 21ST DAY OF MAY 2015/31ST VAISAKHA, 1937

Bail Appl..No. 2089 of 2015

**CRIME NO. 1182/2014 OF VANCHIYOOR POLICE STATION,
THIRUVANANDAPURAM DISTRICT.**
.....

PETITIONER(S)/ACCUSED:

**LIJI MANOJ, AGED 33 YEARS,
W/O MANOJ ARJUNAN, PULLOLI HOUSE,
PULLIYIL LANE, PRASANTH NAGAR,
THURUVIKKAL VILLAGE, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM.**

BY ADV. SRI.T.RAJASEKHARAN NAIR

RESPONDENT(S)/COMPLAINANT:

- 1. THE STATE OF KERALA,
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
HIGH COURT OF KERALA**
- 2. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PETTAH POLICE STATION, PETTAH,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**
- 3. THE STATION HOUSE OFFICER,
VANCHIYOOR POLICE STATION, VANCHIYOOR,
THIRUVANANTHAPURAM - 695 001.**

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT.REMA.R

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION
ON 21-05-2015, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE
FOLLOWING:**

mbr/

K. ABRAHAM MATHEW, J.

B.A. No.2089 of 2015

Dated this the 21st day of May, 2015

O R D E R

Petition filed under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

2. The petitioner is the second accused in Crime No.1182 of 2014 of Vanchiyoor Police Station registered for the offence under Sections 420 and 506(1) read with Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code. The first accused is her husband. The allegation is that they cheated the victims to the tune of Rs.1,25,00,000/- (Rupees One Crore Twenty five lakhs only).

3. Heard.

4. The learned counsel submits that the report of the Inspector of Police dated 25.02.2015, who conducted the investigation would show that the petitioner is not involved in the commission of offences. I can't agree. In the report which is Annexure-B it is specifically stated that the earlier investigation was confined to certain irrelevant facts and there was a deep rooted conspiracy, which requires investigation. This is not a report in favour of the petitioner. The petitioner had earlier filed B.A.No.1089 of 2015. Her husband was also a party to it. Annexure-A is the order. Her prayer for anticipatory bail was refused. The petitioner in this case was directed to surrender before the investigating officer within ten days if she was so advised. The alleged change of circumstance, which is

the filing of Annexure-B report, is not in her favour. She is not entitled to maintain this second application.

5. The learned counsel submits the petitioner will surrender before the investigating officer. She may do so.

In the result, this application is dismissed.

sd/-
K. ABRAHAM MATHEW
JUDGE

R.AV

//True Copy//

PA to Judge