



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

Tuesday, the Fifteenth day of November Two Thousand Sixteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice S.VAIDYANATHAN

CRL OP(MD) No.19956 of 2016

MOHAMMED ABDUL KHADAR JEYALANI

... PETITIONER/A1

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
KARAIKUDI NORTH POLICE STATION,
SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT,
CR NO. 457 OF 2016.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : No Appearance

For Respondent : Mrs.S.PRABHA, Government Advocate, (Crl.side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-


Apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offences punishable under **Sections 420, 460 and 402 I.P.C in Crime No.457 of 2016** on the file of the respondent police the petitioner has come forward with this petition seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Heard the learned Government Advocate for Respondent.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner along with A1 have agreed to sell a car bearing registration No.TN 65 W 5779, Mahindra Make Tourist vehicle and obtained a sum of Rs.3.15 lakhs and thereafter neither sold the car nor refunded the amount received and thereby cheated the defacto complainant.

4. Laccording to the petitioner since there are some monetary transactions between the defacto complainant and the petitioner, the complaint has been cleverly invented by the defacto complainant without any iota of truth or any paper to support such wild and bald allegations.

5. Learned Government Advocate would submit that the petitioner and A1 created forged documents and sold the car to the defacto complainant and thereafter on 04.08.2016, the defacto complainant



was asked to bring the car to Tamilnadu Mercantile Bank, P.P.Kulam Branch and when they brought the same, the Manager of the Bank seized the vehicle for the outstanding loan and also on the ground that the documents given by the petitioner are forged one. Hence, based on the complaint of the defacto complainant the present case has been registered. Further, the Chief Manager, Indian Overseas bank also preferred a complaint that the petitioner was working as representative for their recovery agent in the name and style of M/s.R.R. Associates in Karaikudi and the whereabouts of the 22 vehicles seized by R.R. Associates is not known and enquiry is pending.

6. Taking note of the fact that a serious offence is said to have been committed by the petitioner, the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is required regarding fabrication of documents and selling of vehicle. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
15/11/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
KARAIKUDI NORTH POLICE STATION, SIVAGANGAI DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.19956 of 2016
Date :15/11/2016

sj
SH/KM/AR-CS-II:23.11.2016:2P/3C