



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

Thursday, the Twenty First day of July Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.11689 of 2016

K.R.RADHA KRISHNAN

..PETITIONER/ACCUSED No.1

Vs.

STATE REP.BY

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

CANTONMENT POLICE STATION,

TRICHY CITY.

CR NO. 389 OF 2016.

..RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S R.YAMUNA 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.1, apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under Section 420 IPC, in Crime No.389 of 2016 on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner received a sum of Rs.3,20,000/- from the de facto complainant on promising to make arrangement for getting visa to the de facto complainant and also job in abroad. However, he failed to do so and when the de facto complainant demanded the money, the petitioner threatened him with dire consequences and on complaint, case has been registered.

3.The case of the petitioner is that earlier, for the very same allegation, the de facto complainant gave a complaint before the Superintendent of Police, Thanjavur District against one Suriya, who is the office boy of the petitioner and on enquiry, the said Suriya promised to repay the amount. However, as there was delay in repaying the amount, the de facto complainant has given the present complaint against the petitioner. The petitioner is an innocent person and he is no way connected with the crime.

4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that the petitioner received a sum of Rs.3,20,000/- on promising to send the de facto complainant to abroad and subsequently, he did not do anything and when the de facto complainant demanded money, the petitioner threatened him with dire consequences. He further submitted that it is a job racketing case.



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

WEB COPY

sd/-

21/07/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, CANTONMENT POLICE STATION,
TRICHY CITY.

2 THE ADDL. PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S R.YAMUNA Advocate SR.No.38542

ORDER IN

CRL OP(MD) No.11689 of 2016

Date :21/07/2016

PBK/AAL-MPA/SAR-I 26/07/2016 ::2P-4C::