



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

Thursday, the Sixth day of August Two Thousand Fifteen
PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) No.14743 of 2015

SANTHI

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED NO.2

Vs

THE STATE REP BY INSPECTOR OF
PANAGUDI POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.179/2015)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.S.PALANIVELAYUTHAM Advocate

For Respondent : MRS.S.PRABHA, Govt. 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 A2, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Section 406, 420 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.179 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. According to the defacto complainant the accused 1 and 2 have received Rs.21,60,000/- (Rupees twenty one lakhs and sixty thousand only) from the defacto complainant and other 18 persons assuring to get employment in Nygeria, but they failed to do so and when this was asked, the accused threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the first accused is the husband of the petitioner and he only received the amount from the defacto complainant as per the complaint and the petitioner is nothing to do with the allegations made in the complaint. It is further submitted that first accused was arrested and remanded to the judicial custody and the third accused was granted anticipatory bail by the Sessions Court.

4. Per contra, the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) on instructions, would submit that the complaint specifically states that the accused 1 and 2 have obtained Rs.21,00,000/- (Rupees twenty one lakh only) by giving assurance to the defacto complainant and 17 others to secure employment in Nygeria. The petitioner is also actively participated in this occurrence and she further submitted that the custodial interrogation is very much necessary.

5. Considering the submissions of the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) and the graveness of the offence, this court is of the opinion that the petitioner is not entitled to get anticipatory bail.



6. Accordingly, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
06/08/2015

WEB COPY / TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)
Madurai Bench of Madras High Court,
Madurai - 625 023.

TO

1. THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, MADURAI BENCH OF
MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.
2. THE STATE REP BY INSPECTOR OF PANAGUDI POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.14743 of 2015
Date :06/08/2015

2P/3C
AM/PRV/SAR-II/11.08.2015.