



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

Thursday, the Twenty Fifth day of January Two Thousand Eighteen

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice R.PONGIAPPAN

CRL OP(MD) No.401 of 2018

M.RAGUNATHAN

... PETITIONER/SOLE ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY,
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PAVOORCHATRAM POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.
IN CRIME NO.482 OF 2017.

... RESPONDENT/COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : M/S.S.T.SASIDHARAN TAMILKANI, Advocate

For Respondent : M/S.A.ROBINSON, Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor : M/S.R.PAUL SUKUMAR, Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner, who is the sole accused, apprehend arrest at the hands of the respondent Police for the offence punishable under Sections 417 and 420 IPC., in Crime No.482 of 2017 on the file of the respondent Police, seek anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the petitioner cheated the de-facto complainant on assuring to get a Government Job for his son and daughter. For which he received a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- in three installments. When the de-facto complainant questioned the same, the petitioner refused to give the said amount. Hence, the defacto complainant lodged a complaint before the respondent police.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submitted that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case. He further submitted that the petitioner has not committed any offence as alleged by the



prosecution and hence, pleads for grant of anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

4.The learned Government Advocate(Crl. Side) submitted that investigation is still pending.

WEB COPY

5.The submissions made on either side are considered. As per the case of the prosecution, it is alleged during the time of occurrence, the petitioner has received a sum of Rs.7,00,000/- from the de-facto complainant, after making promises for arranging a Government Job to the son and daughter of the de-facto complainant. Till now the promise made by the petitioner is not fulfilled. Even, the amount, which was received from the de-facto complainant is also not repaid. Accordingly, for the purpose of recovery of mis-appropriated amount custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

6.Considering the above facts, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail in favour of the petitioner. Hence, this petition is dismissed.

sd/-
25/01/2018

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
PAVOORCHATRAM POLICE STATION,
TIRUNELVELI DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S.S.T.SASIDHARAN TAMILKANI Advocate SR.No.1420

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.401 of 2018
Date :25/01/2018

PK/PM-PN/SAR-4/02.02.2018 : 2P/4C