

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR

MONDAY, THE 19TH DAY OF OCTOBER 2015/27TH ASWINA, 1937

Bail Appl..No. 5874 of 2015 ()

CRMP 2407/2015 of SESSIONS COURT, PALAKKAD
CRIME NO. 742/2015 OF PUDUNAGARAM POLICE STATION , PALAKKAD

PETITIONER/ACCUSED:

SUCHITRA, AGED 32 YEARS
D/O RAVUNNIKUTTY NAIR, CAVIL SANKAR KRIPA, OOTTARA
KOLLENGODE P.O., CHITTUR TALUK, PALAKKAD DISTRICT.

BY ADV. SRI.SURIN GEORGE IPE

RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT:

STATE OF KERALA
REPRESENTED BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.

BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR MS..R.REMA

THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 19-10-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:

B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR, J.

B.A. No.5874 of 2015

Dated this the 19th day of October 2015

O R D E R

The petitioner is the sole accused in crime No.742/2015 of Pudunagaram Police Station, Palakkad district registered under Sections 420, 468 and 471 I.P.C.

2. The prosecution allegation is that while the petitioner was employed as Gramin Dak Sevak, she forged the signature of two depositors and withdrew an amount of Rs.38,520/- and misappropriated the same. The petitioner has filed this application praying for the relief under Section 438 Cr.P.C.

3. Heard.

4. The learned Public Prosecutor has opposed the

application.

5. It appears that there are materials to *prima facie* connect the petitioner with the commission of the offence. The offence alleged against the petitioner is a very serious offence. From the facts and circumstances of the case, I am of the view that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary to ascertain as to whether the petitioner is involved in similar other offence or not. In the said circumstances, I am of the view that this is not a fit case where an order under Section 438 Cr.P.C. in favour of the petitioner will be justified.

In the result, this application stands dismissed.

Sd/

B.SUDHEENDRA KUMAR,
JUDGE

dl

// True Copy //

PA to Judge