



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

Wednesday, the Twenty Seventh day of March Two Thousand Nineteen

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice M.DHANDAPANI

CRL OP(MD) No.4550 of 2019

PARTHASARATHY

... PETITIONER / ACCUSED

Vs

THE STATE REP.BY
THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE
VANGAL POLICE STATION,
KARUR DISTRICT.
(IN CRIME NO. 69 OF 2019)

... RESPONDENT / COMPLAINANT

For Petitioner : Mr.R.KARUNANIDHI Advocate

For Respondent : Mr.A.ROBINSON Govt. Advocate (Crl. Side)

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

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioner who is apprehending arrest at the hands of the respondent police for the alleged offence under Sections 294(b) and 506(i) and 380 of IPC and Section 4 of Tamil Nadu Prohibition of Charging Exorbitant Interest Act, 2003 in Cr.No.69 of 2019, on the file of the respondent police, seeks anticipatory bail.

2.The case of the prosecution is that the defacto complainant had borrowed a sum of Rs.45,000/- from Sarathi Finance through one Ravi, who is the employee of the Sarathi Finance. In these circumstances, on 26.02.2019, the defacto complainant has gone to Kerala with his family members for arranging money in order to repay the borrowed money. Thereafter, on 27.02.2019 at about 10.00 p.m., at the instigation of one Ravi, ten members entered into the defacto complainant house and taken all the household articles from his house and also taken land documents. After knowing the same, when the defacto complainant approached one Ruthran and Ravi, they scolded and threatened the defacto complainant. Hence the complaint.

3.The learned counsel appearing for the petitioner would submit that the petitioner has been falsely implicated in this case and he has nothing to do with the alleged offence and he is innocent and hence, he would pray for anticipatory bail.



4.The learned Additional Public Prosecutor appearing for the respondent police would submit that the petitioner who is the owner of the Sarathi Finance. Hence, he objected for grant of anticipatory bail.

5.Considering the facts and circumstances of the case and also considering the specific overtact against the petitioner, this Court is not inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioner.

6.Accordingly, the Criminal Original Petition is dismissed.

sd/-
27/03/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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

TO

1 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
VANGAL POLICE STATION,
KARUR DISTRICT.

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

+1. CC to Mr.R.KARUNANIDHI Advocate SR.No.5659

PS/VR/SAR-3/12.04.2019/2P/4C

ORDER
IN
CRL OP(MD) No.4550 of 2019
Date :27/03/2019