



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

Thursday, the Twenty Eighth day of December Two Thousand Seventeen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr Justice S.VAIDYANATHAN

CRL OP(MD) No.18052 of 2017

G.MAHENDRAN

... PETITIONER/ ACCUSED  
(RANK NOT KNOWN)

Vs

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
ECONOMIC OFFENCE WING-II, TRICHY DISTRICT.  
(CRIME NO.1 OF 2017)

2 THILAGAVATHI

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.V.CHANDRAPANDI Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.K.ANBARASAN, Government Advocate (Crl.side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence punishable under Sections 406, 420 and 120(b) of I.P.C., and Section 5 of T.N.P.I.D. Act, in Crime No.1 of 2017 on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.Heard the learned counsel on either side.

3.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner and his wife were running a business in the name and style of 'G.M.G. Real Estate' and they offered attractive schemes and thereby, collected huge amount from the public. Based on the same, the defacto complainant and others invested their money in the aforesaid company. But, the petitioner and his wife did not repay the amount to the defacto complainant as promised. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complainant against the petitioner and his wife before the respondent police.

4.It is submitted by the learned counsel for the petitioner that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has not committed any offence and he prays for anticipatory bail in favour of the



petitioner. He further submitted that the petitioner's wife/A2 has been granted anticipatory bail in Crl.O.P.(MD)No.9779 of 2017, dated 15.11.2017, by this Court.

5.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.side) submitted that the investigation is going on. He also submitted that the petitioner is not arrayed as an accused as on date and he has been issued summons to appear for the purpose of enquiry.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the fact that the respondent police is entitled to issue summon any one to appear for the purpose of enquiry and that cannot be a ground for granting anticipatory bail. Hence, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner. Accordingly, the anticipatory bail is dismissed.

sd/-  
28/12/2017

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,  
ECONOMIC OFFENCE WING-II, TRICHY DISTRICT.
  - 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,  
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI
- +1. CC to M/S.V.CHANDRAPANDI Advocate SR.No.37104

ORDER  
IN  
CRL OP(MD) No.18052 of 2017  
Date :28/12/2017

pmu/rm  
SH/RR/SAR-3:02.01.2018:2p/4c