



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

Friday, the Thirteenth day of October Two Thousand Seventeen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.13940 of 2017

1 AYYAVUTHEVAR @ KUMARTHEVAR
2 BETHU
3 POTHUMANI @ POTHUNKANI
4 PANDI
5 RANI @ INDHURANI

... PETITIONERS/
ACCUSED No.A1,2,4,8 & 9

Vs

THE STATE THROUGH
THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
SAPTUR POLICE STATION,
MADURAI DISTRICT.
CRIME NO.9/2017.

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.E.R.GURU BALACHANDRAN Advocate

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

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners/accused Nos.1, 2, 4, 8 and 9, who are apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 506 (i) of IPC, in Crime No.9 of 2017, on the file of the respondent police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the de-facto complainant had paid a sum of Rs.6,50,000/- (Rupees Six Lakhs and Fifty Thousand only) to the first accused to purchase gold at cheaper rate, but the first accused neither give any gold to the defacto complainant nor return the money to him. When the defacto complainant demanded the first accused to give gold or to return the money to him, all the accused threatened the defacto complainant with dire consequences. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint against the petitioners and other co-accused before the respondent Police.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioners would submit that the petitioners are innocent and they have not committed any offence as alleged by the prosecution.



4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) appearing for the state would submit that the first accused committed the offence and cheated the defacto complainant. He further submitted that this Court has already dismissed the very same anticipatory bail application in Crl.O.P.(MD)No.1788 of 2017 dated 03.10.2017.

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl.side), I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, this Anticipatory bail petition is dismissed.

sd/-
13/10/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE SUB INSPECTOR OF POLICE
SAPTUR POLICE STATION,MADURAI DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT,
MADURAI

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.13940 of 2017
Date :13/10/2017

SMA/RR-BS/SAR-4/30.10.2017:2P/3C