



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

Tuesday, the Tenth day of March Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice P.N.PRAKASH

CRL OP(MD) No.23497 of 2014

ABDUL SUBAN

... PETITIONER/SOLE ACCUSED

Vs

STATE REP BY THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH,
MADURAI DISTRICT.

(CR.NO. NOT KNOWN OF 2014) ... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.R.MURUGAN Advocate

For Respondent : MR.A.P.BALASUBRAMANI Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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


ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No.21 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) appearing for the State.

3. When this anticipatory bail petition was filed, the Crime Number was shown as Not Known of 2014 and therefore, on 21.01.2015, this Court granted interim anticipatory bail to this petitioner with a direction to appear before the respondent police for two weeks. In the status report dated 06.02.2015, the respondent police has stated that the petitioner did not appear before them in compliance with the orders passed by this Court. It was also represented by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) that a regular case in Crime No.21 of 2015 for the offences under Sections 406, 420 and 506(i) IPC has been registered against the petitioner.

4. On reading of the complaint, it appears that the defacto complainant had retired from the Tamil Nadu Mercantile Bank and was given substantial money as retiral benefits. This petitioner got acquainted with her and induced her to invest her money in Real Estate on the promise that he would purchase lands in her name. Over a period of time, the petitioner has been extracting money from her



and totally a sum of Rs.58,00,000/- has been paid by the defacto complainant to the petitioner. The petitioner, after receiving huge amount, did not register any land in her name, but made himself scarce.

5. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) submitted that the defacto complainant has fallen sick on account of this incident and is under treatment in Chennai.

6. Taking into consideration the serious nature of the allegations against this petitioner, this is not a fit case to grant anticipatory bail to him. Hence, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
10/03/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH, MADURAI DISTRICT.

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

ORDER
IN
CRL OP (MD) No.23497 of 2014
Date :10/03/2015

AA/13.03.2015/2p- 3c/