

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION No.5634 of 2017

ORDER:

This petition is filed, by the petitioner/accused No.1, under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail in Crime No.10 of 2016 on the file of the Station House Officer, Parigi Police Station, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 420 and 506 read with 34 I.P.C.

2. The learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is a Government employee; therefore the *de-facto* complainant falsely implicated him in this case.

3. The learned Additional Public Prosecutor opposed the bail.

4. A perusal of the record reveals that one Srinivasulu Oggu is the *de-facto* complainant. The record further reveals that accused No.2 is the daughter and accused No.3 is the son-in-law of the petitioner-accused No.1. As per the allegations made in the complaint, the petitioner along with accused Nos.2 and 3 made a false promise to the *de-facto* complainant and others that they will provide jobs to them in Railway Department if they pay an amount of Rs.9,00,000/-. Believing the words of petitioner, the *de-facto* complainant and two others paid an amount of Rs.8,00,000/- to accused Nos.2 and 3. It is further alleged that they have taken S.S.C. and Intermediate original certificates of the *de-facto* complainant. The gist of the allegations made in the complaint is that the petitioner and accused Nos.2 and 3 cheated

the *de-facto* complainant and two others by collecting an amount of Rs.8,00,000/-.

5. A perusal of the record reveals that the petitioner and accused Nos.2 and 3 have commonly filed CrI.M.P.No.223 of 2017 in Crime No.10 of 2016 on the file of the Court of the XII Additional District and Sessions Judge, Vikarabad, under Section 438 Cr.P.C. and the same was dismissed. The record *prima facie* reveals the role played by the petitioner and accused Nos.2 and 3 in the commission of the offences. In these days, it is not uncommon to cheat the unemployed youth in the name of jobs.

6. Taking into consideration the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner as well as the impact of the offences on the society, this Court is of the considered view that it is not a fit case to grant pre-arrest bail to the petitioner.

7. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J

Date: 21.08.2017
Ivd