



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

Tuesday, the Twelfth day of July Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.10716 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.189 OF 2016) ... RESPONDENT/ COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S S.SIVAPRAKASH Advocate
For Respondent : M/S.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 offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506(i) IPC, in Crime No.189 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 job in abroad, the petitioner along with other accused persons received a sum of Rs.76,000/- as advance and subsequently, they did not arrange any job and cheated the de facto complainant and when the amount was demanded by the de facto complainant, the accused threatened him with dire consequences. On complaint, case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.When the Criminal Original Petition was taken up for hearing on 30.06.2016, there was no representation on the side of the petitioner and therefore this petition was posted today under the caption for dismissal and even today, there is no representation on the side of the petitioner. Therefore, this petition is disposed of on merits on the basis of the arguments advanced by the learned Government Advocate (Criminal side).



4.The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) submitted that this is a case of job-racketing and on promising to get job in abroad, the petitioner along with other accused persons received a sum of Rs.76,000/- as advance and subsequently, they did not arrange any job and cheated the de facto complainant and when the amount was demanded by the de facto complainant, the accused threatened him with dire consequences

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the serious nature of allegation made against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner and accordingly this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
12/07/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1.THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI

2.THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
TIRUMANGALAM TOWN POLICE STATION, MADURAI DISTRICT,

RL/3C/2P/SKS/RR/SARI/15/7/2016

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.10716 of 2016
Date :12/07/2016