



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

Wednesday, the Eighteenth day of February Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP(MD) No.1229 of 2015

1 SENTHILKUMAR

2 ANANDALINGAM

... PETITIONER(S) / ACCUSED

Vs

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, RAMNAD DT, CRIME NO.
NOT KNOWN OF 2015

... RESPONDENT(S) / COMPLAINANT(S)

For Petitioner : M/S.A.BASKARAN Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.A.P.Balasubramani Government Advocate (Crl. Side)

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


ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 417 and 420 IPC in Crime No. Not known of 2015 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side).

3. The anticipatory bail application was filed by showing Cr.No. not known and therefore, by order dated 27.01.2015, this Court granted interim anticipatory bail to the petitioners for a period of two weeks with a direction to the petitioners to appear before the respondent police. When the case was called on 10.02.2015, the respondent police filed their status report, in which it is stated that a case in Cr.No.7 of 2015 for the offence under Section 420 I.P.C. has been registered against the petitioners.

4. On 10.02.2015, this Court heard the learned Counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) and observed that a case of cheating has been made out against the petitioners. At that time, the learned Counsel for the petitioners submitted that he would get instructions from the petitioners whether they will return the sum of Rs.1,45,000/- to the defacto complainant. Therefore, the matter was posted on 13.02.2015 under the captio "for orders" with a direction to the petitioners to file an undertaking affidavit that they will repay the



money within two weeks from that date. The defacto complainant was also directed to be present before this Court on 13.02.2015. On 13.02.2015, this case was posted to 17.02.2015 under the caption "for orders". On 17.02.2015, there was no representation for the petitioners and hence, the case was adjourned to 18.02.2015 under the caption "for orders".

5. Today also there is no representation for the petitioners. Therefore, this Court went through the records and found that the defacto complainant Arunkumar had given a sum of Rs.1,45,000/- to the petitioners herein, who promised that they will get him a job in Germany and thereafter, they neither got the job nor returned the money. Thus this is the case of job racketing.

6. Taking into consideration the serious nature of allegations levelled against these petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners.

7. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
18/02/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, RAMNAD DT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI

TS/24.02.2015/2P-3C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.1229 of 2015
Date :18/02/2015