

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

Wednesday, the Sixth day of January Two Thousand Sixteen

PRESENT

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

CRL OP(MD) No.23019 of 2015

A. KANNADHASAN

... PETITIONER/ACCUSED RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

STATE REP.BY

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,

KARUR DISTRICT,

CR IME NO NOT KNOWN OF 2015.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.D.SELVANAYAGAM Advocate

For Respondent : MR.K.ANBARASAN, Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

For Intervenor : MR.R.V.RAJASEKARAN, 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, apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police, for the alleged commission of offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 I.P.C., in Crime No.27 of 2015, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner received a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant, promising to get a job for him at Tamil Nadu Papers Limited, Karur and the petitioner did not get the job and repay the amount to the de-facto complainant. When the same was demanded by the de-facto complainant, the petitioner threatened him with dire consequences. Hence, the de-facto complainant has given the complaint for the offences stated above.

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.

4. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a contract employee of Tamil Nadu Papers Limited, Karur, from 1993 onwards and he received a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant and handed over to A2.

5. The learned Government Advocate (Criminal side) submitted that the petitioner received a sum of Rs.8,00,000/- on the promise of getting job to the de-facto complainant, but he failed to do so and did not return the money and thereby, cheated the de-facto complainant. This is a case of job racketing. If anticipatory bail is granted, he will continue similar offence.

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>

6. Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering fact that the petitioner is promising to get a job for the

de-facto complainant and did not get the job and repay the amount, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners. Hence, both the anticipatory bail petitions are dismissed.

sd/-
06/01/2016

/ TRUE COPY /

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


TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE, DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH, KARUR DISTRICT.

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

SMN2
CSL/NGM-SS/SAR-II/11.01.2016/2P/3C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.23019 of 2015
Date :06/01/2016



WEB COPY