



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

Monday, the Twentieth day of June Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.8412 of 2016

CHANDRASEKAR

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED No.1

Vs

THE STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
TANJORE,
CR NO. 8 OF 2016,
THANJAVUR DISTRICT.

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.V.Karthirvelu, Senior Counsel for
M/S K.N.GOVARDHANAN Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.P.Kannithevan, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)


PETITION FOR BAIL Under Sec. 439 Cr.P.C.

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner is arrayed as accused No.1, who was arrested and remanded to judicial custody on 07.05.2016 for the alleged offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506(i) IPC, in Crime No.8 of 2016, on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the de facto complainant collected amount from 76 persons and handed over the same to the petitioner's wife and son on the promise made by the petitioner that he would secure jobs in Electricity Board and Transport Corporation. The petitioner after receiving the amount, he did not secure job. When the de facto complainant demanded to return the amount, the petitioner threatened him with dire consequences. On complaint, case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.The case of the petitioner is that he is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. Due to political rivalry, a false case has been foisted against the petitioner. Earlier, one Radhakrishnan gave a similar complaint against the petitioner and de facto complainant and the same was enquired into by the police and thereafter the same was closed as



there was no evidence to prove any of the alleged transactions and the anticipatory bail petition filed by the petitioner in that case in Crl.O.P(MD)No.14494 of 2015 was closed observing that the complaint has been closed. Now the said Radhakrishnan preferred the present complaint through the de facto complainant. The petitioner is in custody from 07.05.2016.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl.side) submitted that this is a case of job-racketing and huge amount is involved in this case and investigation is pending. If the petitioner is released on bail, he will tamper the evidence and hamper the investigation.

5.The allegation against the petitioner is that the de facto complainant collected money from various persons and gave the same to the petitioner's wife and son. The earlier complaint given by one Radhakrishnan against the petitioner and de facto complainant on the same allegation is closed as there is no evidence to prove any of the alleged transactions. Considering the above facts and also considering the fact that the petitioner is in judicial custody from 07.05.2016, this Court is inclined to enlarge the petitioner on bail with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioner is ordered to be released on bail on executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) with two sureties each for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Judicial Magistrate No.I, Thanjavur and on further condition that the petitioner shall appear before the respondent police daily at 10.00 a.m., until further orders.

sd/-
20/06/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

Sub-Assistant Registrar (C.S.)

TO

- 1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.I, THANJAVUR.
- 2 DO THRO' THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE, THANJAVUR AT KUMBAKONAM.
- 3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, TANJORE, THANJAVUR DISTRICT.
- 4 THE SUPERINTENDENT, CENTRAL PRISON, TRICHY.
- 5 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR, MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

+1. CC to M/S K.N.GOVARDHANAN Advocate SR.No.31364

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.8412 of 2016
Date :20/06/2016