

IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM

PRESENT:

THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE A.HARIPRASAD

TUESDAY, THE 3RD DAY OF NOVEMBER 2015/12TH KARTHIKA, 1937

Bail Appl..No. 6066 of 2015 ()

CRIME NO. 978/2015 OF KADACKAVOOR POLICE STATION, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM

PETITIONER/ACCUSED :

**VINOD KUMAR, AGED 37 YEARS
S/O.BALAKRISHNA PILLAI, KRISHNA, MADAVOOR P.O.,
KILIMANNOOR, THIRUVANANTHAPURAM (DIST)**

**BY ADVS.SRI.BLAZE K. JOSE
SRI.M.RAJESH**

RESPONDENTS/COMPLAINANTS :

**1. STATE OF KERALA
REP. BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
HIGH COURT OF KERALA, ERNAKULAM.**

**2. SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
KADACKAVOOR POLICE STATION**

R1 & R2 BY PUBLIC PROSECUTOR SMT. R. REMA

**THIS BAIL APPLICATION HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 03-11-2015,
THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY PASSED THE FOLLOWING:**

Mn

A.HARIPRASAD, J.

B.A.No.6066 of 2015

Dated this the 3rd day of November, 2015

ORDER

Application filed under Section 438 of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

2. Petitioner is the accused in Crime No.978 of 2015 of Kadackavoor Police Station registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420, 465, 468 and 471 r/w Section 34 of the Indian Penal Code.

3. Prosecution case is that the petitioner along with other accused produced fake documents before the Manager, Syndicate Bank on 05.02.2015 for availing a vehicle loan. On enquiry, it was revealed that the possession certificate of property produced by the petitioner and the other accused was a fraudulent one.

4. Heard both sides.

5. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner worked as the Assistant Manager of Daiwik Motors Pvt. Ltd., Kollam. A customer (1st accused) approached him for purchase of the vehicle. The first accused produced the documents before the Bank. The

petitioner has no role in the first accused taking steps for availing the loan. The petitioner also contended that he still works as an employee of Daiwik Motors Pvt. Ltd. Had there been any nefarious activities on his part, certainly he would have been fired out, is the contention of the learned counsel for the petitioner.

6. Considering the nature of allegations and after hearing on both sides, I am of the view that no custodial interrogation is necessary. Hence, the following conditions are issued:

- (a) Petitioner shall surrender before the Investigating Officer within a period of 'two weeks' from today and submit himself for interrogation. Thereafter, he shall be released on bail on his executing a bond for ₹25,000/- (Rupees Twenty Five Thousand Only) with two solvent sureties for the like sum to the satisfaction of the Investigating Officer.
- (b) The petitioner shall appear before the

Investigating Officer as and when required for the purpose of interrogation.

- (c) The petitioner shall co-operate with the investigation of the case.
- (d) The petitioner shall not intimidate or attempt to influence the witnesses.
- (e) The petitioner shall not in any manner interfere or meddle with the investigation.
- (f) The petitioner shall not, during the period of this bail get involved in any offence.

In case any of the above conditions is violated, bail granted hereby is liable to be cancelled for which the investigating officer may move application before the jurisdictional magistrate.

Sd/-
A.HARIPRASAD, JUDGE.

AS

/True Copy/

P.A. to Judge