



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Tuesday, the Seventh day of July Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

WEB COPY

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.11754 of 2015

JEYACHITRA

... PETITIONER(S) / ACCUSED 1

Vs

STATE REP BY: THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
TOWN POLICE STATION, ARUPPUKOTTAI TOWN,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DT. (CRIME NO.341 OF 2015)

... RESPONDENT(S) / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.L.M.VIJAY BOOMINATHAN Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Government Advocate(Crl.Side)

PETITION FOR ANTICIPATORY BAIL Under Sec. 438 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-


The petitioner, who is arrayed as A1, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 120(b), 406 of IPC, in Crime No.341 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that when the petitioner was working as Sales woman in Lakshmana Achari Jewellery shop at Aruppukottai. She has stolen 1118 grams of gold jewels worth about Rs.29,00,000/-.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent and she has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the occurrence said to have taken place between January, 2014 to September 2014, but the complaint was lodged only on 24.02.2015 and after the investigation, the respondent police has registered the case on 09.04.2015.

4.The learned counsel for the petitioner further submitted that as per the status report filed by the respondent, the other co-accused are still working in the same shop and they are taken vengeance against the petitioner, she has been falsely implicated in this case.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) filed a counter affidavit opposing grant of bail to the petitioner and also submitted that this petitioner is the prime accused and while selling gold jewels, she has shown lessor weight, instead of actual weight and excess cash from the customers was misappropriated by the



accused. It is further submitted that when the petition enquiry was pending, the petitioner has not complied with the condition, while other accused were co-operating for the investigation and the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

6. Considering the above facts, this Court is of the view that this petition is not entitled to anticipatory bail. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
07/07/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

1 THE ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI

2 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
TOWN POLICE STATION, ARUPPUKKOTTAI TOWN,
VIRUDHUNAGAR DT. (CRIME NO.341 OF 2015)

1. CC to M/S.L.M.VIJAY BOOMINATHAN Advocate SR.No.36519

DM 8 7 15 2p;. 4c

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.11754 of 2015
Date :07/07/2015