WEB COPY

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

Friday, the Third day of July Two Thousand Fifteen

PRESENT

THE HON`BLE MR JUSTICE K.KALYANASUNDARAM

CRL OP(MD) Nos.7579 & 10693 of 2015

1 G.SEENIVASAN
2 SULOCHANA ... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED RANK NOT KNOWN IN CRL OP(MD)NO.7579/15

GUNASEKARAN ... PETITIONER/1ST ACCUSED IN CRL.OP(MD)NO.10693/15

Vs

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
NALATTINMUTHUR POLICE STATION AT VANARAMUTTI,
THOOTHUKUDI DISTRICT.
CR. NO.159 OF 2015. ... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT IN BOTH PETITIONS

For Petitioner : M/S.M.SOLAISAMY Advocate IN BOTH PETITIONS

For Respondent : MR.K.V.RAJARAJAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side) IN BOTH PETITIONS

For Intervenor : MR.BALAMURUGAPANDIAN, Advocate IN BOTH PETITIONS

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners, who are arrayed as A1 to A3 apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under sections 294(b), 506(i) and 420 of IPC, in Crime No.159 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.According to the de-facto complainant namely Parthiban, the accused demanded Rs.2,50,000/- to secure employment in aboard, he pledged his jewels and obtained loan of Rs.99,000/- from the bank and also borrowed money from other sources and paid Rs.2,50,000/- and on 13.06.2014, he was sent to Iran, where he was not given job as assured by the accused and also salary was not paid to him as assured by them.

3. The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the petitioners are agricultural coolies and they did not give any assurance as alleged by the de-facto complainant; that the job was arranged by an agency at Mumbai and the defacto complainant was selected to work as Steward in Iran and he has sent along with about 50 persons, when others are working, the de-facto complainant alone came back and demanded money from the Mumbai Agency and since it was refused, a false complaint was given against the petitioners. The learned counsel further submitted that the petitioners are innocent persons and they have been falsely implicated in this case.

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

WEB COPY

4. Mr.Balamurugapandian, learned counsel for the Intervenor/de-facto complainant submitted that the first petitioner is a Diploma Holder in Fire Safety service and he was assured employment at abroad and the accused have received Rs.2,50,000/-. The de-facto complainant worked in abroad for 83 days, but he was only paid Rs.33,000/- and he was not given employment as assured by the accused.

5. Heard the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent.

6.Considering the nature of the allegations made against the petitioners, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence, both the petitions are dismissed.

sd/-
03/07/2015

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1. THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
NALATTINMUTHUR POLICE STATION AT VANARAMUTTI,
THOOTHUKUDI DISTRICT.

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

SR : 14.07.2015 : 2p/3c

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) Nos.7579 & 10693 of 2015
Date :03/07/2015

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