



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

Thursday, the Twenty Second day of January Two Thousand Fifteen  
PRESENT

**The Hon`ble Mr.Justice P.N.PRAKASH**

CRL OP(MD) No.23933 of 2014

WEB COPY

ABDUL WAHID

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED - 2

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
AIRPORT POLICE STATION,  
TIRUCHIRAPPALLI.  
(CR.NO.375 OF 2014)

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

A.SYED MOHAMMED

... INTERVENER

For Petitioner : M/S.S.RENGASAMY Advocate

For Respondent : Govt. Advocate ( Crl. Side)

For Intervener : MR.S.SUNDAR MANI, Advocate

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 420 and 506(i) IPC in Crime No.375 of 2014 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner, the learned counsel for the Intervener and the learned Government Advocate(Crl.Side) appearing for the State.

3. It is the case of the prosecution that one Alavudeen(A1) purchased materials valued at Rs.4,50,000/- from the defacto complainant on 18.11.2014, on the assurance that within one hour, he will make payment. After taking delivery of the materials, the said Alavudeen(A1) absconded. Alavudeen was arrested by Police on 25.12.2014.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that this petitioner is a leather merchant and is a respectable citizen and is nothing to do with Alavudeen. He has also stated that the materials were purchased by this petitioner from Alavudeen for the purpose of constructing his

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



house. It is his further contention that this petitioner's name does not figure in the FIR.

5. It is true that the name of the petitioner does not figure in the FIR, but after the arrest of Alavudeen, it came to light from the confession statement that Alavudeen had handed over the goods of the defacto complainant to this petitioner for discharging the loan of Rs.4,58,000/-. Therefore, custodial interrogation of this petitioner is essential in order to recover the goods of the defacto complainant.

6. Under such circumstances, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to this petitioner. Hence, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-  
22/01/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE  
AIRPORT POLICE STATION  
TIRUCHIRAPPALLI
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR  
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI

+1. CC to M/S.S.RENGASAMY Advocate SR.No.3210

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.23933 of 2014  
Date :22/01/2015

PA/27.01.15/2P/4C