



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

Thursday, the Fourteenth day of March Two Thousand Nineteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.3881 of 2019

ABDUL RAHUMAN

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED RANK NOT KNOWN

Vs

STATE REP. BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
FORT POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
(CRIME NO.532/2018)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : MR.R.ALUAGUMANI Advocate

For Respondent : MR.K.SUYAMBULINGA BHARATHI,
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 offences under Sections 379 of IPC, in Cr.No.532 of 2018, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the persons who lost their bike gave complaint before the Law Enforcing Agency. The Law Enforcing Agency secured one accused Asarudeen native of Trichy. Thereafter, on his confession it reveals that several bikes were stolen by them and based on the confession this petitioner was implicated in this case and 27 bikes were recovered from the petitioner.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner is an innocent person and he did not commit any offence as alleged by the prosecution. The case was foisted by the respondent police only in order to implicate the petitioner in false case. The Al is not a genuine person. Hence, he left with him. Accordingly, he prayed for anticipatory bail.



4.The learned Government Advocate (Crl.Side) appearing for the State would submit that there are 27 bikes were recovered from the petitioner and Unless the petitioner is arrested and the investigation is to be conducted, the other crime may not come to the light. Hence, custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary.

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and considering the submission made by the learned Government Advocate (Crl. Side) that the custodial interrogation of the petitioner is necessary for investigation and considering the cases pending against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6.Accordingly, this criminal original petition stands dismissed.

sd/-
14/03/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

- 1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
FORT POLICE STATION,
TRICHY DISTRICT.
- 2 THE ADDITIONAL PUBLIC PROSECUTOR,
MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT, MADURAI.

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.3881 of 2019
Date :14/03/2019

JM/VR/SAR 4/21.03.2019/2P/3C