



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT

(Criminal Jurisdiction)

Wednesday, the Second day of December Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice V.M.VELUMANI

CRL OP(MD) No.20336 of 2015

JEYA CHITRA

..PETITIONER/9th ACCUSED

Vs

STATE REP.BY THE DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH
VIRUDHUNAGAR, VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO. 11 OF 2015)

..RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S P.SANTHOSHKUMAR Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.K.ANBARASAN, 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 accused No.9, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 409, 420, 465, 468, 471 and 120-B of IPC, in Crime No.11 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and her husband along with other accused have collected money from the defacto complainant by promising to get a job in the Transport Corporation and in the Educational Department. After receiving money from various persons by giving a false promise of arranging appointment in the respective department, they did not get any job, as promised. When the defacto complainant and others asked for return of the amount, the petitioner and other accused threatened the defacto complainant and others with dire consequences.

3.The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is an innocent person and her name has been falsely implicated in this case and she did not receive any money from the defacto complainant. She is the house wife and she is having two children.


4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that the petitioner and others received money from number of persons by false promise of getting job in the Transport Department and Educational Department. The petitioner's husband is the A1 and the petitioner is the A9. This is the job racketing and the investigation is pending if the petitioner is released on anticipatory bail, she will tamper the witnesses and hamper the prosecution. The custodial interrogation of the petitioner and others are necessary.

5.Considering the serious nature of the charges levelled against the petitioner and the investigation is pending, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-

02/12/2015

/ TRUE COPY /



TO

- 1 THE ADDL.PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,MADURAI.
- 2 THE DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, VIRUDHUNAGAR, VIRUDHUNAGAR DISTRICT.

+1. CC to M/S P.SANTHOSHKUMAR Advocate SR.No.68963

WEB COPY

ORDER IN

CRL OP(MD) No.20336 of 2015

Date :02/12/2015

PBK/SK-SKN/SAR-II 09/12/2015 ::2P-4C::