



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

Tuesday, the Fifth day of July Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP (MD) No.10713 of 2016

UMMUL PARITHA

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.2

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TIRUMANGALAM TOWN POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO. 188 OF 2016)

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.S.SIVAPRAKASH, Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.P.KANNITHEVAN, Government 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.188 of 2016, on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on promising to get a job, the petitioner along with A1 received a sum of Rs.76,000/- from the defacto complainant and subsequently, he did not get the job and return the amount. On complaint, a case has been registered against the petitioner.

3.When the matter was taken up for hearing 30.06.2016, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner argued the matter and as this Court was not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner, the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner sought time till 04.07.2016 with regard to settlement. Hence, the matter was adjourned to 04.07.2016 and on that day, there was no representation for the petitioner and the case was posted to 05.07.2016 (Today) under the caption "for dismissal".

4.Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is innocent and she has not committed any offence as alleged by the



prosecution and her name has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that already the husband of the petitioner deserted the petitioner and took all the money and therefore, she is not in a position to settle the matter.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that this is a case of job racketing. The petitioner and A1 collected amount from the defacto complainant and others and the total amount is Rs.3,65,000/-.

6. Considering the serious nature of allegations made against the petitioner and that it is a job racketing, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
05/07/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
TIRUMANGALAM TOWN POLICE STATION, MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10713 of 2016
Date :05/07/2016

am
SH/AAL-MPA/SAR-III:20.07.2016:2P/3C