



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

Monday, the Thirteenth day of June Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.8538 of 2016

A. MANOHAR

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED NO.1

Vs

THE STATE REP BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
CITY CRIME BRANCH,
TIRUNELVELI,
(CRIME NO.11/2016)

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S S.BASKARMATHURAM Advocate
For Respondent : M/S.K.ANBARASAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)
For Intervenor : M/S.H.ARUMUGAM, Advocate

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 offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 IPC, in Crime No.11 of 2016, on the file of the respondent police and hence, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that on the false promise of arranging for a job in Tamil Nadu Electricity Board, the petitioner along with second accused cheated the petitioner to the tune of Rs.5,00,000/-. On complaint case has been registered for the above said offences.

3.The case of the petitioner is that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution. He has been falsely implicated in this case.

4.When the matter was taken up for hearing on 06.06.2016, the learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was ready to pay the amount to the de facto complainant. On such representation, this Court directed the respondent police to produce the de facto complainant today and accordingly the de facto complainant is present before this Court today.



5. Without informing the same, today the learned counsel for the petitioner, seeks permission of this Court to withdraw the petition and the said request is rejected.

6. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) appearing for the respondent submitted that it is a case of job racketing and investigation is pending.

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

sd/-
13/06/2016

/ 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
CITY CRIME BRANCH,
TIRUNELVELI,

+1. CC to M/S.H.ARUMUGAM, Advocate, SR.No.30214

RL/4C/2P/NGM/MP/SARI/15/6/2016

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.8538 of 2016
Date :13/06/2016