



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

Monday, the Twenty Second day of October Two Thousand Eighteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.K.ILANTHIRAIYAN

CRL OP(MD) No.14063 of 2018

MANIRAJ @ MANIKANDAN ... PETITIONER / ACCUSED RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

STATE REPRESENTED BY.

THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE

ECONOMIC OFFENCE WING NO II, TRICHY,

TRICHY DISTRICT.

(IN CRIME NO. NOT KNOWN OF 2018)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

M.RUBESH

...PETITIONER/INTERVENOR

For Petitioner : Mr.N.RANJITH Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.V.NEELAKANDAN, Additional Public Prosecutor

For Intervenor : Mr.N.SUDHAGAR NAGARAJ Advocate

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner/Accused apprehends arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the offences punishable under Section 420 of I.P.C. in Crime No.not known of 2018, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant lodged a complaint by stating that the petitioner is running a garments and he approached the defacto complainant for loan of Rs.29,00,000/- for developing his business and thereafter, the petitioner repaid a sum of Rs.10,00,000/- and refused to give the balance amount of Rs.19,00,000/-. Hence the complaint.

3.When the matter was taken up for hearing on 17.09.2018, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that petition enquiry pending and hence, the matter was posted today for reporting compliance. Today, when the matter is taken up for hearing, the learned Additional Public Prosecutor would submit that the enquiry has been conducted and a case in crime No.1 of 2018 has been registered as against the petitioner for the offence under Section 420 of I.P.C. on the file of the respondent police and the



investigation is going on.

4.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he has been falsely implicated in this case.

5.The learned counsel appearing for the intervenor would submit that the petitioner has involved in 8 cases and he has cheated more than Rs.1 crore and hence he vehemently opposed the grant of anticipatory bail.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case, since, there are 8 cases pending as against the petitioner and the amount involved in this case is very huge, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner

7.Accordingly, this criminal original petition is dismissed.

sd/-

22/10/2018

/ 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 NO II,
TRICHY, TRICHY DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to M/S.N.RANJITH Advocate SR.No.19967

PS/RR/SAR-1:30/10/2018:2P/4C

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.14063 of 2018

Date :22/10/2018