



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

Tuesday, the Fifth day of January Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.19354 of 2015

T. SRIRAM

... PETITIONER/2nd ACCUSED

Vs

THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH,
TRICH CITY,
(CRIME NO.05/2014)

... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr. N.SEKAR Advocate

For Respondent : Mrs.S.PRABHA, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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


ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who is arrayed as accused No.2, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506(i) of IPC, in Crime No.5 of 2014, on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant and A1 Kathiresan, who is the Sri Lankan Nation, were working together in a Super Market in Saudi Arabia for 18 years and they decided to start a business of selling Iron and decided to invest a sum of Rs.50 lakhs and the defacto complainant decided to give a sum of Rs.10 lakhs. When they returned to India, A1 was staying in Trichy. The petitioner is maternal Aunt's son of A1. The defacto complainant gave a sum of Rs.38 lakhs to A1 and petitioner in the Apartment of A1. He gave further sum of Rs.2 lakhs, to them. They did not start the business. When the defacto complainant demanded money, they threatened him with dire consequences.

3.The case of the petitioner is that the entire transaction was between the defacto complainant and A1. The petitioner has nothing to do with the said transaction and he is innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution and he has been falsely implicated in this case.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that the petitioner and A1 received a sum of Rs.50 lakhs from the defacto complainant promising to start business jointly and cheated him and the investigation is pending. The petitioner and A1 are Sri Lankan and if anticipatory bail is granted he will abscond and the investigation will be tampered.



5.Considering the charges levelled against the petitioner that he in collusion with A1, cheated the defacto complainant a sum of Rs.50 lakhs and the investigation is pending and the contention of learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) will abscond, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
05/01/2016

WEB COPY

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH, TRICH CITY.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19354 of 2015
Date :05/01/2016

AM
NS/JGB-DP/SAR I/28.01.2016 : 2P/3C