



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

Monday, the Twenty Fifth day of January Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Ms.Justice V.M.VELUMANI

CRL OP(MD) No.19209 of 2015

1 DAISY RANI
2 KISSAN

... PETITIONERS/ACCUSED 2 & 4

Vs

THE STATE THROUGH
THE INSEPECTOR OF POLICE
B.H.E.L POLICE STATION,
TRICHY,
CRIME NO.107 OF 2015

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S P.GANAPATHI SUBRAMANIAN 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 petitioners, who are arrayed as accused Nos.2 & 4, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 294(b), 406, 420 and 506 (i) of IPC, in Crime No.107 of 2015 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant is working in B.H.E.L., company, Trichy and A1/Anthony Doss is also working in the said B.H.E.L., company. On 15.03.2014 A1 requested the defacto complainant to lend a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- to overcome the financial constrain in his family and he promised to repay the said amount within one week. The defacto complainant applied for a loan and gave a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- to A1/Anthony Doss, who executed a promissory note for the same. But he did not repay the said amount as promised by him. When the same was demanded by the defacto complainant, the petitioner gave a evasive reply. At that time, one Sethuraman/A3 guaranteed the repayment of the loan amount by A1 and asked the defacto complainant not to demand money from the first accused. Subsequently, the defacto complainant demanded money, the petitioner, A2 to A4 and other accused persons threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences and threatened to kill him. On the complaint given by the defacto complainant, the case has been registered for the above said offences.

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

3.The case of the petitioners is that the defacto complainant



got cheque and promissory note at the police station from A1, who is the husband of the first petitioner and father of the second petitioner. The petitioners are innocent persons and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that A1 borrowed a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- from the defacto complainant and he did not repay the said amount. A3 guaranteed the repayment and investigation is pending.

5.The learned counsel for the petitioners submitted that earlier this Court referred the matter to the Mediation and Conciliation Centre attached to this Court and the defacto complainant did not appear before the Mediation Centre and there is no settlement.

6.The allegations against the petitioners and other accused are when the defacto complainant demanded the amount borrowed from him, they threatened to murder him.

7.Considering the serious allegations made against the petitioners, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-

25/01/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSEPECTOR OF POLICE,B.H.E.L POLICE STATION,TRICHY

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

CSL/SKS-RR/SAR-I/04.02.2016
2P/3C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19209 of 2015
Date :25/01/2016