

Crl.O.P.No.12277 of 2016**S.VAIDYANATHAN,J.**

The petitioners who were arrayed as A5 and A6 respectively and was remanded to judicial custody on 23.5.2016 for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 342, 387, 367 and 371 IPC in Crime No.363 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police seek bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that one Manoj from Bihar is working in the defacto complainant's weaving unit and the above said Manoj informed the defacto complainant that his relatives from Bihar came to Kerala for building construction work, but on being dissatisfied with their work at Kerala, they came to Erode to meet Manoj. On 22.5.2016, the said Manoj received a phone call from his relative informing that he along with six other persons are confined in a lodge by A1 and A2 and the accused persons told them that they were sold to the petitioners herein for Rs.5,000/-. Since Manoj did not know Tamil, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint.

3. Learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that the 1st petitioner is a bore well rig contractor and the 2nd petitioner is a rig machine operator. The victims of this case are no way connected with bore well rigging profession and only skilled plumbers will be employed by the petitioners in their profession. Thus, the allegations found in the complaint are false and baseless.

S.VAIDYANATHAN, J.

msr

4.Learned Government Advocate (crl.side) submitted that as per complaint, these petitioners have procured the labourers from Bihar State for Rs.45,000/- and thus committed exploitation of labour.

5.From the confession of the 1st petitioner it is made clear that the accused persons have abetted the victims, belonging to Bihar Sate and confined them in a lodge and thereafter they were sold to the petitioners herein for Rs.5000/- per head. Taking note of the fact that these petitioners have procured the victims who belong to the State of Bihar in order to exploit them and that there is a gang of accused are involved in this kind of immoral activities and further in order to unearth the real facts, this Court is of the view that custodial interrogation of the petitioners are necessary. Hence this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Therefore this petition is dismissed.

17.6.2016

msr

Crl.O.P.No.12277 of 2016