



BEFORE THE MADURAI BENCH OF MADRAS HIGH COURT
(Criminal Jurisdiction)
Date : 03/09/2019

WEB COPY

PRESENT

The Hon`ble Mr.Justice G.R.SWAMINATHAN

CRL OP(MD) . No.11752 of 2019

1. R. Sanjeevi,
2. S.Immanuel,
3. Rani,
4. S.Jeyakumar,
5. Kumar Alias Mathivanan, ... Petitioners/Accused Nos.1 to 5

Vs

The State rep.by
The Inspector of Police,
District Crime Branch,
Dindigul.
Crime No. 27/2019.

... Respondent/Complainant

K.V.M.Jeeva ... Intervene Petitioner/Defacto Complainant
in CRL MP(MD).NO.7702 OF 2019
IN CRL OP(MD).NO.11752 of 2019

For Petitioner : M/s. S. Sivakumar,
Advocate.

For Respondent : Mr.A.Robinson,
Government Advocate (Crl.Side)

For Intervenor : M/s.P.Muthuvijayapandian, Advocate

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

PRAYER :-

For Anticipatory bail in Crime No.27 of 2019 on the file of
the respondent police

ORDER : The Court Made the following order :-

The petitioners apprehending arrest at the hands of the
respondent police for the offences punishable under Sections 120(b),
406, 420 and 506(i) of I.P.C., in Crime No.27 of 2019, seek
anticipatory bail.

2.Heard the learned counsel for the petitioners and the learned

<https://hcservices.ecourts.gov.in/hcservices/>



Government Advocate (Criminal side). This Court heard the learned counsel for the intervenor also.

3.The allegation of the de-facto complainant is that he paid a sum of Rs.40,00,000/- to the petitioners as they promised to raise a loan to the tune of Rs.200 crores from a foreign bank. These are serious allegations and therefore, the matter requires custodial interrogation also.

4.It is seen that the primary role was played only by the first accused. However, it is also brought on record that a sum of Rs.1,00,000/- was put in the bank account of the second petitioner herein. The third petitioner is the wife of the first petitioner and the fourth petitioner is another son of the first petitioner, the fifth petitioner is the son-in-law. From this, I get an impression that the de-facto complainant wants to falsely implicate all the members of the family.

5.Taking note of the aforesaid submission, this Criminal Original Petition is dismissed as far as the first and second petitioners are concerned.

6.Considering the facts and circumstances, this Court is inclined to grant anticipatory bail to the petitioners 3 and 5 with certain conditions. Accordingly, the petitioners 3 and 5 are ordered to be released on bail in the event of arrest or on their appearance before the learned Judicial Magistrate No.II, Dindigul and on their executing a bond for a sum of Rs.10,000/- (Rupees Ten Thousand only) each with two sureties for a like sum to the satisfaction of the learned Magistrate concerned and on further condition that the petitioners 3 and 5 shall appear before the respondent police as and when required for interrogation. The petitioners 3 and 5 shall comply with the conditions stipulated under Section 438 Cr.P.C. Scrupulously.

7.The petitioners 3 and 5 shall appear before the concerned Magistrate within a period of 15 days from the date on which the order copy made ready, failing which, the petition for anticipatory bail shall stand dismissed.

sd/-
03/09/2019

/ TRUE COPY /

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



TO

1 THE JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE NO.II,
DINDIGUL.

2 DO-THROUGH :THE CHIEF JUDICIAL MAGISTRATE,
DINDUGAL DISTRICT.

3 THE INSPECTOR OF POLICE,
DISTRICT CRIME BRANCH,
DINDIGUL.

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

+1 CC to M/s.S.SIVA KUMAR, Advocate (SR-14767[I] dated 04/09/2019)

ORDER

IN

CRL OP(MD) No.11752 of 2019

Date :03/09/2019

SJI

AE/MMS/SAR-IV (10.09.2019) 3P 6C