

CRL.O.P.No.13635 of 2016

S.VAIDYANATHAN,J.

Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 341, 294(B), 323, 336, 392, 397 and 506(ii) of IPC in Crime No.1086 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police, the petitioner, who is arrayed as A9, has come forward with this petition seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned counsel for the petitioner and the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) appearing for the respondent police.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with the other accused entered into a Hyundai Showroom at Manapakkam, in which the defacto complainant is the Branch Manager, assaulted the security guard and committed theft of cars from the said showroom.

4. The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner worked as Project Manager in a private concern viz., SSLF City and Housing. The respondent police intentionally tried to implicate the petitioner as a co-accused in this case. He further would submit that the petitioner is innocent and he has been falsely implicated in this case.

5. Learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) would submit that the investigation is pending and the petitions already filed by the co-accused seeking anticipatory bail were dismissed by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.12448 of 2016 dated 27.06.2016.

S.VAIDYANATHAN,J.

ari

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also taking note of the fact that the petitions already filed by the co-accused seeking anticipatory bail were dismissed by this Court in Crl.O.P.No.12448 of 2016 dated 27.06.2016, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

29.06.2016

CRL.O.P.No.13635 of 2016