

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE T.SUNIL CHOWDARY

CRIMINAL PETITION NO.7683 OF 2017

ORDER:

Petitioner, who is A1 in Cr.No.170 of 2016 on the file of Station House Officer, Central Crime Station, D.D. Hyderabad, registered for the offences punishable under Sections 406 and 420 r/w 34 IPC, filed this petition under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail.

2. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner was falsely implicated in this case. Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor representing the State submitted that the petitioner along with other accused collected an amount of Rs.1,00,00,000/-; therefore, it is not a fit case to grant bail to the petitioner.

3. The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner herein along with other accused started Needs Today Online Solution Pvt.. Ltd., having its Corporate office at No.164, 1st floor, F3, Nisha Plaza, Karuneegar Street Adambakkam, Chenniah. It is the further case of the prosecution that the company availed the services of several employees for collecting of money through Online. It is the further case of the prosecution that the company collected an amount of Rs.1,00,00,000/- and failed to supply material or repay the amount.

4. The petitioner filed CrI.P.No.1384 of 2017 on the file of this Court under Section 438 Cr.P.C. seeking anticipatory bail and the same was dismissed on 08.03.2017 with the following observations:

“The remand report further shows that the petitioner and A2 being Director of M/s Needs Today online Solutions Pvt. Ltd., have collector about Rs.One crore through their employees for development of online groceries business as per the agreement, and failed to

provide the franchisee, thereby cheating them. Further, the report given by the company was registered on 05.09.2016 whereas the present case came to be registered on 02.08.2016. Therefore, it cannot be said that the present report is lodged as a counter blast report given by the accused. Even otherwise having regard to the nature of allegations made against the petitioner and amount involved being huge, I am not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.”

Learned Addl. Public Prosecutor submitted that investigation is pending and there are no changed circumstances from the date of dismissal of the earlier bail petition till today.

5. Taking into consideration the nature of the offences alleged to have been committed by the petitioner, the stage of investigation and the previous order of this Court, I am of the considered view that it is not a fit case to grant bail to the petitioner at this stage.

6. Accordingly, the Criminal Petition is dismissed.

DATED: 12-09-2017.
Hsd

T.SUNIL CHOWDARY, J